

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, April 2, 1902.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

BRIDGE ACROSS LITTLE TENNESSEE RIVER.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the bill S. 3231, there having been a House bill of similar purport reported favorably to the House.

The bill (S. 3231) to legalize and maintain a new steel bridge erected in place of the old wooden structure across the Little Tennessee River at Niles Ferry, Tenn., by the Atlanta, Knoxville and Northern Railroad, was read.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Senate bill just read be put on its passage. A House bill similar in its provisions has been favorably reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I made that report by direction of the chairman of the committee. The only difference between the two bills is that in this Senate bill there are certain amendments which seem to make it more satisfactory to such members of the Tennessee delegation as are interested in the subject. They all assent to it. This bill passed the Senate unanimously, and the corresponding bill of the House has been unanimously reported by the committee. I ask, therefore, that this Senate bill may be put on its passage.

The SPEAKER. Are the bills now substantially the same?

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Yes, sir.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill; which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. DAVIS of Florida, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection, the corresponding House bill, No. 9964, will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

On motion of Mr. CANNON, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union (Mr. LAWRENCE in the chair), and resumed the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Improvement of the Yellowstone National Park: For the improvement of the Yellowstone National Park, in accordance with the approved project, including the maintenance of existing improvements, to be expended by and under the direction of the Secretary of War, \$250,000, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may enter into a contract or contracts for such labor and materials as may be necessary for the completion of the project, including annual maintenance and repairs, or the work may be done and the materials purchased otherwise than by contract, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in any one year \$250,000, and not to exceed in the aggregate \$500,000, exclusive of the amounts herein and heretofore appropriated: *And provided further*, That of the amounts so appropriated not to exceed \$50,000 may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be expended in the Yellowstone Forest Reserve east of the park, and not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended in the Yellowstone and Teton Forest Reserves south of the park.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of much personal gratification to me to find in this sundry civil bill a liberal appropriation for the proper care and the immediate and continued improvement of our great national park. The people familiar with this subject will approve this provision now, and posterity, which will realize more fully its benefits, will commend us for our foresight and judgment in a spirit of eternal gratitude. This money will be well and wisely spent, and its expenditure will create lasting results that will please, instruct, and benefit humanity for ages yet to come.

Mr. Chairman, Yellowstone Park is the world's wonderland. It beggars description. The most eloquent tongue fails to describe its surpassing wonders, and the gifted pen of the most imaginative poet can not adequately picture the infinite variety of its sublime realities. After you have read and heard all that mortal man can say, you must see it yourself to fully appreciate all its glories and startling revelations. It never palls; the eye never tires. From the time you leave Livingston until you return, the scenery is an inspiration and simply indescribable. It is one grand panorama of loveliness beyond comparison, a symphony of colors, a combination of architectural miracles.

Take it all in all, Yellowstone Park is the greatest, the grandest, the most picturesque, and the most marvelous picture in nature's art gallery—painted in all the radiant colors of the rainbow by the unerring, heroic hand of the Infinite—sculptured by the Supreme Creator of the universe—a testifying demonstration that the Great Jehovah liveth.

The establishment of this magnificent park, to be forever safe from the destroying vandal, and sacred for all time from the devastating hand of greedy commercialism, does great credit to the farseeing statesmanship of the men who conceived it, and to those

who are now faithfully executing a great trust for the benefit of millions yet unborn.

This national park was dedicated to humanity. It belongs to the people. It is sacred to nature. No vandal must ever be permitted to desecrate it. Every citizen of the Republic should behold its glories and witness the beauties of nature's most perfect picture. I hope more people every year will visit this inspiring park, and I know they will go away benefited in mind and body. As the years come and go it will become more and more a sanitarium for the afflicted, an art gallery for the lovers of the beautiful, a Bohemia for the lotus-eating dreamers of the Better Day, and a great national playground, the recreation place of millions of the citizens of the Republic, where the rich and the poor, the great and the small shall have an equal right to enjoy and commune with nature in her primeval wonders and in all her pristine glories.

The provisions in this bill for Yellowstone Park are made, I am informed, in accordance with the recommendations of Capt. Hiram N. Chittenden, a distinguished officer in the Engineer Corps of the Army, now detailed to the park and in charge of the improvements. He is beyond all question the right man in the right place. He has done and is doing a great work, not sufficiently appreciated, perhaps, by the unthinking and the casual observer, but the work itself will be his lasting monument, and the consciousness of duty well done for duty's sake will be his greatest reward.

I visited the park last summer, saw for myself, and speak from personal knowledge. Every member of Congress should uphold the hands of Captain Chittenden, and all his commendable efforts should be encouragingly sustained by the Government. I am and ever will be a friendly advocate of Yellowstone Park, and in or out of Congress I will always do all in my power for its best interests; and I am glad in this connection to pay a just and merited tribute to the genius of gallant Captain Chittenden.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just a few words more. In my opinion the western boundary of the park should be extended to include Jackson Lake, the Teton Mountains, and the domain sometimes called the Hole in the Wall. Every disinterested person with whom I have talked concerning this matter has concurred in this conclusion. Aside from the beauties of the natural scenery of this adjoining land to the park, it is of great importance that it should be incorporated into the park for the reason that the wild animals, especially the deer, the elk, and the buffalo, roam there from the park during certain seasons of the year, and hunters lying in wait slaughter them remorselessly.

This is a shame and should be stopped, and the best way to do it is by an extension of the park's boundary. It will cost little to do this now, and in my judgment Yellowstone Park will ere long become the last place in this country where the wild game—the big game—can live out their natural lives unmolested by the barbarian pot-hunter and the semicivilized sportsman. Every loyal friend of the national park and every true friend of our wild animals should favor this extension of the boundary of Yellowstone Park. It should be acted on now. No time should be lost.

This additional territory can be obtained to-day by the United States Government very cheaply, and it ought to be taken in before its value increases.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I trust the provision in this bill for Yellowstone Park will be passed without modification. It is truly in the interest of the people, and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in my judgment, is entitled to much commendation and the thanks of the American people for his broadminded statesmanship in the matter. [Applause.]

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I simply desire to corroborate all that has been said by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER], and I think the committee in increasing this appropriation has met a want which has been felt for many years, and that is the improvement along broad and generous lines so necessary in this park. The extension of the boundaries of the park is also an important matter which should be looked after by Congress. The committee, however, in its judgment, has seen fit to increase the appropriation for the improvement of the roads upon a basis which will inure to the benefit of the traveling public in particular, and to the country at large. I hope sincerely that the appropriation will be passed as proposed by the committee, and that no objection will be presented.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER], in speaking in favor of this appropriation, has said he visited this park recently. It was my good fortune to be on the first expedition of 1871 under the auspices of the United States Geological Survey and under the immediate charge of Prof. F. V. Hayden, the first party which ever explored the Yellowstone Park. Never shall I forget, as the wonders of that region burst upon our view in almost every mile that we covered

after we entered the Fire Hole Basin and the region surrounding the Yellowstone Park, the impression it made upon me. It seemed almost as if we had entered into a combination of fairylands and infernal regions. The first impression on one hearing the rumbling and the thunder of the land before the eruption of Old Faithful, as we first viewed it, is an impression made upon a man in his youth, which can never be obliterated. It will be an everlasting monument to the memory of Professor Hayden and his able assistant, James Stevenson, that they at once conceived the idea that this region should be preserved forever as a public park for the uses and the pleasure of the American people.

One must visit that region to realize its great attraction. One must be there from year to year over a long course of time to have seen how the large game has gradually been obliterated from our country, until now there are but a few specimens left, and those mainly in the zoological parks of our country. The only hope for the preservation of the bison, commonly known as the buffalo, will be in the regions of this park. It is essential that this appropriation be made, and I wish to assure my colleagues that money expended in the preservation of this region is money well spent for the benefit of the entire American people. It is now under the Government control. It is thrown open to all the American people. The rates of travel and the rates of board are regulated by the Government. There is no imposition on the people. This great natural preserve is kept for their benefit, and I trust that this appropriation which tends to preserve that interesting and wonderful region will not be altered, amended, or changed in any respect. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Park: For continuing the establishment of the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Park; for the compensation and expenses of two civilian commissioners and the assistant in historical work; maps, surveys, clerical and other assistance, messenger, office expenses, and all other necessary expenses; foundations for State monuments; mowing; historical tablets, iron and bronze; iron gun carriages; and model in relief of the Nashville and of the Atlanta battlefields; for roads and their maintenance, and for the purchase of land already authorized by law; in all, \$50,000.

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations a few questions in regard to this matter. I would like to know what are the fixed charges in this sum appropriated for the park; that is, how much is paid out for salaries, etc.

Mr. CANNON. They are as follows:

Amount estimated for.....	\$50,000
ESTABLISHMENT.	
Salaries.....	\$22,140
Mileage, contingencies, etc.....	1,000
Lodges.....	3,000
New York monument foundation.....	3,000
Monument foundations other than New York.....	1,000
Gun carriages.....	1,920
Wall or iron fence, Point Park, 900 feet.....	2,800
Road and paths in Point Park.....	1,000
Guttering and betterment of roads.....	2,000
	38,400
MAINTENANCE.	
Maintenance and repair.....	9,540
Regular supplies.....	2,000
	11,540
Total.....	50,000

Mr. MADDOX. So that of this sum of \$50,000 appropriated for Chickamauga Park there is practically half, or \$25,000, for salaries and mileage.

Mr. CANNON. Almost.

Mr. MADDOX. One dollar, in other words, is paid for the expense of some salaried official or mileage for every dollar that is put upon the park. Now, there is one thing I am glad to see that the Appropriation Committee has incorporated in this bill, and I desire to call the attention of the House to it in the few minutes that I have. I refer to the section beginning at the bottom of page 98, that the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to prepare and submit in the annual estimate at the next session of Congress a proposition providing for the consolidation of the existing commissions having charge of the several national military parks, etc. Now, we have these parks scattered all over the country, and we have, I think, about three park commissioners appointed for every park, paying them probably \$3,500 a year salary. It is my judgment, and I am satisfied that the committee will agree with me on this subject, that all we need of these park commissioners are three, and those three should be located in the city of Washington, and then have a superintendent for each one of these parks. In that way when we appropriate \$50,000 for the improvement of these battlefields we can get some benefit of this money; but as it is now here is an appropriation of \$50,000 for Chickamauga, and yet absolutely \$25,000 of it is paid as mere sinecures—that is, for salaries—for somebody.

Why, if you go back to the beginning, there has been money enough spent here for the survey of Chickamauga Park, from the start to the finish, to have surveyed the greatest railroad in

the United States. There is not a doubt about that. These positions are mere sinecures, and I am glad to see that the Committee on Appropriations have started out to call the attention of the country to the matter, as I wish to do now. You see there is an appropriation of \$50,000 here in this bill, and \$25,000 of it goes merely for salaries to somebody to do nothing.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the gentleman who has preceded me have made it necessary that I should say what I have to say a little earlier than I expected to. The Committee on Military Affairs and their subcommittee on parks have already taken up this question. One of the members of that committee on the 4th of March introduced a bill (H. R. 12092) relating to that matter and providing for the appointment either of certain officers in the War Department or else a single central commission to work with the aid of such officers, in order to have a central scheme for the management of these military parks. How soon that can be put into full operation we do not know; but the matter is already before the War Department for a report to the Military Committee, with whom the subject properly resides. We expect that report in a day or two, and this very morning we have had a hearing and have had before us a prominent general in that Department, who was formerly in charge of the rebellion records of the Union and Confederate armies. At this hearing the committee went over the possibilities with reference to this matter, in order that it may be put on a proper basis.

Mr. MADDOX rose.

Mr. PARKER. I prefer that the gentleman should wait a moment, but I will yield for an interruption.

Mr. MADDOX. I was simply going to remark that I did not know that bill was pending before your committee or the House, and I wanted to indorse what the other committee had done in this direction.

Mr. PARKER. We do not wish to postpone until the next session of Congress the report of the Secretary of War on this subject, and therefore I shall make the point of order against the proviso contained in this bill, not because it is not right that such a system should be adopted, but because we want it to be investigated now. Propositions are pressing upon our committee for military parks at Stone River, at Perryville, at Appomattox, at Petersburg, at Fredericksburg, and at Atlanta, and in each case the acquisition of land and the appointment of an expensive commission are urged.

In one or two of these places the parks can not be established unless options now before us are taken advantage of, and at the same time we feel that the country will not endure the establishment of one commission after another, involving the appointment of a new commission in each case, with positions which have been referred to here as sinecures. We have before us, however, an example of one park which has not been carried on in this way. As will be seen by this bill, Antietam carries an expense of but \$1,500 a year, while the others involve an expenditure of \$45,000, \$50,000, and \$75,000 a year. The reason for this is that at Antietam, in order to preserve the appearance of the ground as the battle was fought, in order to make it a real place of patriotic memories instead of an artificial picnic ground, the War Department followed the plan not of purchasing the ground, but of obtaining narrow lanes along the battle lines of the various armies and the intrenchments and of putting upon these lanes simple and expensive monuments, showing the directions in which the lanes were crossed by the lines of battle and indicating the points of vantage from which a survey of the field could be obtained.

The whole expense of laying out that field, including an observation tower and all those routes to which I have referred and the wire fences along them, involve an expenditure of only a few tens of thousands of dollars. Now the work is complete and the annual expense is but \$1,500 a year for the maintenance and repair of those roads, and yet everything is indicated just as it was. On some of the other famous battlefields the disposition of every commission to enlarge its own work and the loving enthusiasm of the people who want monuments there have resulted in the employment of landscape gardeners and artists, who in some cases, I dare say, have so improved these fields that they do not look like the old battle grounds in any respect whatever.

In conclusion, this question is now before our committee, and without repeating what I have just said to the House, I shall make the point of order to the clause on page 99, when it is reached, that it is new legislation and not within the purview of an appropriation bill.

Mr. MAHON. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. PARKER. Certainly.

Mr. MAHON. Have you visited the battlefield of Antietam?

Mr. PARKER. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. Do you think the roads are in good condition?

Mr. PARKER. They were when I was there a few years ago.

Mr. MAHON. You had better go and look at them now, and then you will revise your speech.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman makes his point of order, I will try and meet it as best I can. Touching the query of my friend, this legislation for Chickamauga Park, Gettysburg, Shiloh, Vicksburg, was legislation that was enacted under the lead of the Committee on Military Affairs. I trust I have the gentleman's attention. It authorizes commissioners' salaries, as I recollect, of about \$3,500 a year. They have a regular full outfit. The Antietam improvement was not made by virtue of any general legislation. It was picked up on a general appropriation bill when the present junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. McCOMAS] was a member of the Committee on Appropriations. It was in his district, and I suppose was subject to a point of order. But it was entered upon. The improvement was made, and I think quite deserves the approval of my friend. Now, for this improvement there is \$1,500 a year for a superintendent that looks after it. That is all that is needed. In other words, it is a battlefield that is marked.

Now, I want to say to my friend from New Jersey, that of all these Commissions, so far as I know and believe, the Chickamauga Commission has done its work most promptly; and I was gratified when General Boynton, one of these commissioners, in the examination hearings before the subcommittee, stated that after this year there was no further use for that commission; that he was satisfied that one commissioner could do the work, or it could be done without a commission. That is a little extraordinary, when somebody that belongs to a commission should suggest that at some time it may be dispensed with.

I have no doubt that some time ago most of these commissions might have been profitably dispensed with. Here was a general law. The Committee on Appropriations is restricted under the rules to appropriate in pursuance of existing law. The Committee on Military Affairs, having legislative jurisdiction, did not move last year, the year before last, and the year before that. I do not see any signs of its moving. On our examination we thought something ought to be done, and without attempting to usurp jurisdiction of any other committee, we put a provision in a little further on that, in my opinion, is not subject to the point of order; but I will meet that when the point of order comes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Shiloh National Military Park: For continuing the work of establishing a national military park on the battlefield of Shiloh, Tennessee; for the compensation of 3 civilian commissioners and the secretary, clerical, and other services, labor, land, iron gun carriages and historical tablets, maps and surveys, roads, purchase and transportation of supplies and materials, office and other necessary expenses, \$400,000.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if he can inform us how much has been expended up to date on the Shiloh National Park?

Mr. CANNON. In a moment. The appropriations—and I take it that the appropriations fairly measure the expenditures—for 1896 were \$75,000; for 1898, \$60,000; for 1899, \$55,000; for 1900, \$55,000; for 1901, \$55,000; for 1902, \$50,000, and this bill recommends \$400,000, making altogether about \$375,000 or \$380,000, and this \$400,000 makes over \$400,000.

Mr. CANDLER. Over \$400,000?

Now, why I asked this question was simply to say this: This Shiloh National Park is situated, as all very well remember, upon the banks of the Tennessee River, some 21 miles from the city of Corinth, in which I reside. There has been expended, in accordance with the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, including the appropriation in this bill, something over \$400,000 for the establishment and beautifying of this park. There is no way by which this park is accessible. By actual measurement from the park to the center of the city of Corinth it is 21 miles. The park commissioners have constructed, in the direction of the city of Corinth, a macadamized avenue or road 5 miles in length. At the city of Corinth there is a national cemetery, and also one located at Pittsburg Landing, where this park is also located.

There is a Government macadamized road extending from the national cemetery at Corinth to the center of the town. It has been taken up by the city at its terminus and extended a mile in the direction of this park by the construction of a macadamized street. The park commissioners have constructed 5 miles of road, the city of Corinth has constructed 1 mile of road, which leaves a gap of 15 miles, which, if covered by the construction thereon of a macadamized road, would make a complete roadway from the railroad point, at Corinth, to the national park at Shiloh. Every year people gather at Corinth from one end of the country to the other who desire to visit this battlefield. During every week almost in the year there are people who come to Corinth for the purpose of going to the battlefield; but, during the winter months especially, the roads are bad, and the consequence is that they have great difficulty in getting to this park, and a great many

who would otherwise go do not go at all, because of the inaccessibility of the park.

Early in this session of Congress I introduced a bill providing for the construction of a road to fill this gap between the city of Corinth and Shiloh National Park. I introduced this bill at the request of the Gray and the Blue, indorsed at one of their annual reunions by a formal resolution in a meeting which they held upon the battlefield. In this month there will be another meeting of the Blue and the Gray there, as occurs each and every year. They are greatly interested in the construction of this road; and while some members here contend that it is not good policy for the Government of the United States to go into the business of constructing roads over the country, I say that this is an exceptional situation, and, in my judgment, upon proper investigation this road will commend itself not only to the people at large, but, in my judgment, it will recommend itself to the Congress of the United States, especially in view of the fact that it is desired by both the Blue and the Gray in order to make this park accessible to people who desire from time to time to go there and inspect it and look over the battlefield.

The bill I introduced has not yet been reported. I trust later we may have a report on it and a favorable report. I believe if a favorable report is made on this bill, it will commend itself to every member of the House, because of the fact that if the bill should pass and become law the road would be built along a way where every single inch of the ground is historic territory. From the city of Corinth to the Shiloh Park this road would pass all the way through a battlefield, and to anyone who desires to see that battlefield, which is one of the most historic, it would be of great benefit, and especially so in view of the construction of this park on the Shiloh battlefield, which has cost already about \$400,000.

I also desire to say that in the battlefield at the city of Corinth the breastworks can still be seen in a reasonable state of preservation just as they were when the two contending foes met upon that "field of carnage." These breastworks still stand as silent but glorious monuments of the bravery and dash of the Blue, and the chivalry and undaunted courage of the Gray, now a "common heritage" of the greatest, the bravest, the noblest, and most chivalrous people on earth. It was upon this battlefield that Col. W. P. Rodgers, one of the bravest of the brave Confederates, fell leading a Texas brigade and carrying the colors, and his great courage and soldierly bearing so attracted the admiration of the contending foe that he was buried by the order of the Federal general commanding with the honors of war [applause], the second instance of the kind, as I recollect, in all the history of the world. On this battlefield he was laid to sleep wrapped in the colors of the South by the hands of the North, and in that glorious grave he rests to-day awaiting the great resurrection morn, covered with the halo and glory of both armies. Though dead, he will ever live in the hearts of his countrymen.

I am proud of the fact that he was a native Mississippian, and in one of the principal streets of my home city there is an imposing monument erected to his memory, and around his grave there is a beautiful little park, established by the city and cared for by loving hands and warm hearts of sweet women and noble men from their own free contributions. [Applause.] Now, it is these two great battlefields of Corinth and Shiloh which my proposed road will connect and make accessible to the people of the United States who desire to visit these historic spots which commemorate American manhood and this Republic's glory. [Applause.] People traveling from one of these points to the other over this road, in case it should be constructed, would have an opportunity to view every part of the historic ground intervening between the two great battlefields—one at Shiloh and the other at Corinth.

I call attention to the matter at this time in order that you may consider it and in order that it may receive at least proper and full investigation. The bill which I introduced—I wish to impress this fact upon the attention of the House—was introduced by the direct request of "the Blue and the Gray," expressed in a formal resolution passed at a meeting held by them at this battlefield, at which time they appointed a committee, by which this bill was drafted and sent to me with the request that I introduce it. I have done so in pursuance of that request. I ask that the question may be considered and investigated. What practical benefit is there in the Government expending these hundreds of thousands of dollars on this park—and I am not opposing the park—when it is inaccessible? That is the question I want you to consider, and which I desire to leave with you. Consider it and help me to get this bill favorably reported and then passed, and let us construct this road and thereby connect these two great battlefields, these two national cemeteries, and make this park accessible. [Great applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CANNON. No amendment has been offered, I believe, to the paragraph last read; and I shall be content with a single

sentence. I have nothing but the best feeling toward the gentleman and his constituents; but I hope if there should come up any legislative provision that the United States should acquire from the State of Tennessee a public road for the purpose of improving it, the measure will not meet with favorable consideration in this House.

Mr. CANDLER. Suppose the people should donate the ground on which the road is to be constructed?

Mr. CANNON. That would not make any difference. I would not want the Government to take it as a gift. I have no doubt that the people there would be glad to donate it; and I have no doubt that all my people in Illinois would be glad to donate all the public roads there to the General Government. Such would no doubt be the disposition in many other localities throughout the United States, for the Government when it takes charge of a road makes very good road improvements.

But, Mr. Chairman, the best way to secure the improvement of those 15 miles of road down there in Tennessee, so that travelers will not suffer inconvenience in the muddy season, is for our good friends there to come up shoulder to shoulder, as the people do in similar cases in Illinois and elsewhere, and make such improvements on that road as will make it what it ought to be.

The subject is not here for consideration, and that is all I have to say about it. I ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Vicksburg National Military Park: For continuing the work of establishing the Vicksburg National Military Park; for the compensation of three civilian commissioners, the secretary and historian; for clerical and other services, labor, iron gun carriages, the mounting of siege guns, monuments, markers, and tablets giving historical facts, compiled without praise and without censure; maps and surveys; roads, bridges, restoration of earth-works, purchase and transportation of supplies and materials; office and other necessary expenses, \$100,000.

Mr. CANNON. I move to amend by inserting before the word "tablets," in line 20, the word "historical."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of War is authorized and directed to prepare and submit, in the annual estimates, at the next session of Congress a proposition providing for the consolidation of the existing commissions having charge of the several national military parks, or substituting therefor a commission consisting of one or more members to have charge and direction, under the War Department, of the future improvement, care, and maintenance of all of said military parks. The Secretary of War shall also submit estimates for each of said parks in accordance with the proposition herein required to be submitted.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, on the paragraph just read I desire to make a point of order, for two reasons. This paragraph authorizes and directs the Secretary of War to submit estimates and a proposition for new legislation—

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will yield a moment, I wish to ask the Chair whether points of order were reserved on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that when the bill was reported all points of order were reserved.

Mr. CANNON. All right.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, this section authorizes and directs a Government officer to do a certain thing. That, in my judgment, is legislation. That is the first point that I make against the paragraph. The second is that legislation with reference to military parks—and I do not speak of appropriations for them, but of legislation as to the constitution of the commissions having charge of such parks and for the abolition of such commissions—that whole subject belongs to another committee, the Committee on Military Affairs.

The responsibility for initiating such legislation is upon that committee, who have now before them at least 10 bills for the establishment of new parks and new commissions. They have also under consideration the question whether the management and control of the older parks can be more efficient and economical. The question of national cemeteries is also before that committee. It has the responsibility of these matters, and it is not in accordance with the rules of the House that an appropriation bill, reported by the Appropriations Committee, should trench upon the rights of the Military Committee. I think the gentleman in charge of this bill will recognize the desire for the public service which prompts my objection.

This appropriation bill was reported on the 28th day of March, and the bill to which I have just referred, introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS], providing for a single commission, was introduced on the 4th of March, so that we are already in charge of this subject, investigating it, and expect to have a report from the Secretary long before the next session.

I submit to the Chair my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CANNON. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this paragraph is not subject to a point of order. I do not think this is new legislation within the meaning of the rules. It directs the Secre-

tary of War to submit an estimate covering a proposition for the consolidation of the commissions having charge of these parks, etc. That is all. It does not change the law. It is in the form of a resolution of inquiry—

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Will the gentleman allow me to ask whether the paragraph does not propose a change of law by providing that with the estimates the Secretary of War shall submit proposed legislation? Is not that a change of law?

Mr. CANNON. Well, it seems to me that within the meaning of the rules it is not. In other words, it does not affect the expenditure of a dollar; it does not change the law touching these parks. It is in the nature of a resolution of inquiry. And the gentleman who makes the point must admit it is apt and appropriate. That is all I care to say.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY].

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it would help to clear thinking upon this point of order which the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER] interposes by recurring to the language of the rule. That rule, which is the second paragraph of Rule 21, provides as follows:

2. No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress.

That part of the rule clearly has no relevancy to the pending point of order, because the paragraph under consideration makes no appropriation whatever, and if that paragraph is not in order it is because it is obnoxious to the part of the rule which I will now read:

Nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order in any general appropriation bill or in any amendment thereto.

I submit, respectfully, that there is nothing in this paragraph which changes any existing law. If this act becomes a law there will be no change in any existing statute law of the United States. There has been no law pointed out which this would change, and it is simply—as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has said, and exhausted the question in so saying—a resolution of inquiry. Now, what is the subject-matter? The subject-matter is national parks. They are established by various statutes which have been enacted by Congress, not one line of which is disturbed by this paragraph. After those parks are established it becomes the duty, not of the Committee on Military Affairs, but of the Committee on Appropriations, to provide the funds for their maintenance. The Committee on Appropriations has the right to obtain information upon the subject. The Committee on Appropriations, although authorized to appropriate for every official that is named and prescribed in those several acts, is not obliged to do so if in the judgment of that committee those officials are unnecessary.

It is therefore entirely within the right of the Committee on Appropriations to acquire information upon which they can intelligently exercise that judgment and discussion which under the rules of the House is vested in them, and all that it is proposed to do by this paragraph is to acquire that information. It is quite true that if this paragraph proposed to amend the various park acts by abolishing the commissions attached to them, then it would be subject to a point of order. It would be subject to a point of order in the first place, because the committee has no jurisdiction over this subject; and in the second place, because it would be a change of existing law; but the Committee on Appropriations, having jurisdiction to give or withhold the support to the various commissions that are behind these various parks, has the right to have the information upon which that discretion can be intelligently exercised, and as this paragraph proposes nothing further than the acquisition of information for that purpose, I respectfully submit that it is in order in this bill.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the construction of the paragraph seems to me hardly to bear out the contention of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY]. I will read the paragraph submitted:

The Secretary of War is authorized and directed to prepare and submit, in the annual estimates, at the next session of Congress, a proposition providing for the consolidation of the existing commissions having charge of the several national military parks, etc.

He is directed to prepare and submit a proposition providing for the consolidation of existing commissions in his next Book of Estimates. Now, as I have read the existing law providing for the submission of estimates, it provides for the submission of certain amounts for certain specified objects. If those amounts be changed, the Secretary is directed to note what the changes shall be, and note the reasons for those changes.

Now, that is the existing law, as I understand. Now, in addition to that this paragraph provides that in addition to the changes, in addition to the appropriations, he shall submit, further, a proposition for legislation for the consolidation of existing commissions. That is not an inquiry. It is not a change of amount,

nor is it a notation for a change. He is directed to submit proposed legislation. Now, it is true that the Committee on Appropriations has full authority any time they see fit to withhold appropriations from any one of these commissions. They have authority to cut down the expenditures for any of these commissions; they have authority to practically abolish them; but they have no authority to provide that one commission shall have jurisdiction over the territory of any other of the commissions. They have no authority and can get no authority within the rules to provide that the Gettysburg commission shall have authority over Shiloh or Vicksburg or Chickamauga, but that is what this proposed legislation for consolidation would do. It seems to me clear, therefore, that the proposed legislation would be an addition to the work now prescribed for the submission of estimates to Congress by the Secretary of War and that the proposed consolidation would be additional legislation contrary to the rule.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard for just a few moments, perhaps not strictly to the point of order. I would say that if I were in the chair I should hesitate a long time before I should overrule a point of order. But here are some gentlemen on the Military Affairs Committee and on the Committee on Appropriations who admit legislation of this character is absolutely necessary. Now, if it be allowed to remain upon this bill it will become a law. If we are to depend upon the Military Affairs Committee to satisfy, if you please, a jealousy that they may have, it is a command to one that it can not become a law at this session of Congress.

Now, I ask the gentleman here representing the Military Affairs Committee to waive the point of order. Enact your legislation if you desire and if you can. It can do no harm to have it here and in your bill, too, but when you consider the danger of the defeat of legislation of this kind I hope the gentleman will look at the good of the service and withdraw the point of order and permit this legislation to remain in the bill.

Mr. PARKER. Will the gentleman allow me to answer the implied question that he has put to me?

Mr. LOUD. Why, certainly; if it was an implied question.

Mr. PARKER. You asked me to waive the point of order, or to wait.

Mr. LOUD. I did, yes; in the interest of the public service, which you yourself admit this to be.

Mr. PARKER. It is in the interest of the public service that I ought not to waive or to wait. If this bill passes, what is the Secretary of War to say to the inquiry we have already addressed to him relative to this very subject?

Mr. CANNON. It does not affect it in the slightest.

Mr. PARKER. I beg your pardon, I will answer.

Mr. CANNON. All right.

Mr. PARKER. He will say he is "authorized and directed" to give this information at the next session, and that he is not asked for an immediate answer.

Mr. LOUD. That would not prevent him from sending the information to you upon your demand at once.

Mr. PARKER. It is a direction of Congress that he shall take the time to wait and investigate the subject until the next session before he furnishes the information. Meanwhile we are inquiring, and if the gentleman knew the position of affairs in the Military Committee he would feel my responsibility. I will say to him frankly that he will find a minority report in the files of this House with reference to one of these parks, the very best proposition possibly that was before the committee, which was reported in spite of the protest of the minority, establishing a new commission. Yet we have the greatest sympathy with the marking of battlefields and with the preservation for the people of the country of the memory of these battle grounds. But we have no sympathy with expenses which are wastefully incurred. At the same time we can not stop these propositions, we can not say to the gentleman from Mississippi, or the gentleman from Virginia, or the gentlemen from other States where there are battlefields, that they must wait, and that their propositions are all wrong.

Mr. LOUD. What has that got to do with this question?

Mr. PARKER. Why, in order to justify our stand, we must provide a system which will enable the marking of these battlefields to go on in an economical and proper way, instead of going on as it goes on now; we must have a system to propose to these gentlemen, and we must have it now.

Mr. LOUD. This will not prevent you.

Mr. PARKER. It prevents our getting an answer from the Secretary of War.

Mr. LOUD. Why, no. The gentleman says the request is already before the Secretary of War.

Mr. PARKER. And the Secretary of War—

Mr. LOUD. One moment. This bill can not become legislation for at least a month or six weeks, and perhaps two months.

Mr. PARKER. Is not this a revocation of our request?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no.

Mr. LOUD. Not at all.

Mr. PARKER. Does it not direct the Secretary to prepare and submit the information in his next annual estimate at the next session of Congress?

Mr. LOUD. That is just what he will do if you prepare legislation along the line you suggest. But if I can not touch the gentleman's heart, then I have talked in vain, and I will quit.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, just a word more in reply to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS]. I agree with him entirely that it would not be in order for the Committee on Appropriations to report a bill, or a section or paragraph of a bill, withholding any authority from the existing commissions in charge of the several battlefield parks, but I say again that the proposition is simply for the acquisition of information. It is the constant practice of the various committees of the House to report specific resolutions of inquiry which are in substance the same as this paragraph. This paragraph simply provides that the Committee on Appropriations, having the responsibility for the expenditure of the public moneys in respect to this service, ask the Secretary of War what it would cost to do this in some other way. There is nothing more to it. It in no way interferes with the Committee on Military Affairs, which has complete charge of this subject-matter. The question is, simply, tell us at the next session of Congress what it would cost to do this work, which is now extravagantly done—what it would cost to do it in another way, and I submit that it is within the authority of any committee in the House to make that inquiry. Now, this is constantly done, and inquiries are constantly answered by the various heads of the departments.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing to say, but simply want to submit a reference to that part of the rules which refers to change of existing law. On page 344 of the Manual I find the following:

A provision for compiling the record of tests of dairy cows at the Columbian Exposition was held to be legislation and subject to the point of order, although the law gives the Secretary of Agriculture certain general authority to acquire and diffuse information.

It is precisely in point. A provision specially authorizing the acquiring of certain information was held improper, although there was general authority already to acquire that information.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand the gentleman from New Jersey to insist upon his point of order?

Mr. PARKER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The pending paragraph authorizes and directs the Secretary of War to do certain things which in the opinion of the Chair he is not now authorized and directed to do by existing law. In other words, it is an effort to enact law where no law now exists, and is thus a change of existing law and obnoxious to the rules, that—

no provision changing existing law shall be in order on any general appropriation bill or in any amendment thereto.

While the Chair has a great deal of sympathy with the spirit and purpose of the paragraph, he feels constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 98, after line 24, insert:

"No part of the foregoing sums for national military parks shall be used during the fiscal year 1903 for the payment of more than one commissioner for service in connection with each of said parks under the direction of the Secretary of War, nor shall more than 10 per centum of the sums for either of said parks be expended for salaries of clerks or other employees."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Garfield Memorial Hospital: For maintenance, to enable it to provide medical and surgical treatment to persons unable to pay therefor, \$19,000, one-half of which sum shall be paid from the revenues of the District of Columbia and the other half from the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. CANNON. I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 100, line 20, after the word "therefor," insert "under contract to be made with the Board of Charities of the District of Columbia."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Harbor of New York: For prevention of obstructive and injurious deposits within the harbor and adjacent waters of New York City. For pay of inspectors and deputy inspectors, office force, and expenses of office, \$10,200.

Mr. PALMER. I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee if the Government of the United States is paying \$70,260 every year to keep the people of New York from throwing ashes into their own harbor?

Mr. CANNON. I will say, in answer to that, there is a general law that establishes this service, and this appropriation is in pursuance of that general law; and my understanding is that it has been upon the theory that an ounce of prevention is worth a

pound of cure, and that it is practically a service for dealing with deposits of offal which accumulate in the city of New York, to see that it goes out to deep water. The act was passed in 1888.

Mr. PALMER. Would it not be a better plan to enforce the penal laws on the subject, that make it an offense to throw anything into the harbor of New York, and put a few of these people in the penitentiary, and save this \$70,000 that is spent by the Government?

Mr. CANNON. Still answering, that, I suppose, would cover some, but the fact is that nevertheless the law provides for this service; and I will call the gentleman's attention to the fact that New York Harbor is quite an extended harbor; that New Jersey has jurisdiction in part and New York in part, and that there is a large aggregation of people in Brooklyn, New York, Jersey City, and there is a very large commerce. I recollect when the legislation was enacted that it was urged, and I think truly, that the harbor of New York was very seriously impaired from filling up, because the police authorities were not able to enforce the carrying out of this refuse to deep water to be unloaded. Of course, the penal laws might meet it in part, if they could be enforced, and I am inclined to think that Congress did wisely in enacting the legislation; but let that be as it may, the legislation is upon the statute books.

Mr. PALMER. So that you can not do anything but appropriate the money?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, yes; it is in our power to withhold the appropriation for this service; but it is the duty of the Committee on Appropriations to report the appropriations with or without recommendations. We report it with a favorable recommendation. It is in the power of the Committee of the Whole to decrease it or to practically nullify it all so far as this service is concerned for next year by absolutely striking out all of the appropriation.

Mr. PALMER. Do not you think it would be a good plan to put the burden on the people of the city of New York of keeping that harbor clear, and not taxing the people of the United States for this purpose?

Mr. CANNON. The State of New Jersey is near by and you would put it on both of them. I have long been of the opinion that mankind ought to perform their duties, individually and collectively; but unfortunately they do not. The truth is, here is a great harbor, necessary to the commerce in which my friend is as much interested for his constituency as I am, further west; and all of us, perhaps, as much interested as the average citizen of New York. We spend a great many millions of dollars in deepening the channels and in improving the harbors and in having them policed.

Mr. PALMER. And you let them do it; you do not enforce the penal laws, but make us poor taxpayers pay \$75,000 a year to keep those pirates from throwing ashes into their own harbor.

Mr. CANNON. I have long believed that if I had supreme power I could go over to New York and straighten things out. [Laughter.] It would be a pretty big job, I know, with Tammany right in front of me; but I think if I had supreme power I could "turn the rascals out," and if necessary hire others in their places.

A MEMBER. At cheaper wages.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have never, I never shall, oppose an appropriation for the establishment or beautifying national military parks to commemorate the deeds of our heroic dead.

A pressing necessity compels us now to provide for the unfortunate and insane soldiers who come from the Philippines. In our memory of the dead let us not forget the unfortunate living.

Harrowing tales have been told by tongue and by press of the unfortunates who, coming to San Francisco by boat from the Philippine Islands, have been transported thence, diseased in mind and body, over the long, tortuous, and tiresome journey across the continent to the Government hospital for the insane, across the Potomac River from Washington.

We should be most merciful to these soldiers who enlisted and fought and went insane in the service of their country. Already 280 have come to St. Elizabeth Asylum. At least 100 a year will continue to come, according to the estimate of an expert authority. No human heart, no patriotic man desires that these insane soldiers, who voluntarily, for country, faced the dangers and vicissitudes that drove them mad, should have their malady enhanced by the exposures, perils, and troubles incident to a railroad transportation from California to Washington. Troubled minds need rest. Within a week or two a large body of soldiers—unfortunate, insane soldiers—landed at San Francisco and were hurried on their week's travel to the District of Columbia. The newspapers, the chroniclers of events, tell the story of these travels as each new group of insane are hurried away from the most salubrious climate in the world 3,000 miles to the hospital here.

It is not pleasant to see one bereft of reason in the garb of a

soldier, and every reason exists why this Government should take the earliest and best means in its power to cure the ills from which they suffer, and especially when this may have come from the unhealthy conditions that prevail in the tropical climate in which they served.

The Government asylum in Washington is crowded. A personal inquiry this morning brought me the information that there are 2,200 insane patients there, many of them huddled together in cramped and temporary quarters awaiting the building and completion of the addition to the present asylum which Congress so generously provided for in its appropriation of a million dollars two years ago. I am informed that the work is progressing satisfactorily, but that, when completed, it will only accommodate comfortably 2,600 inmates.

According to the annual report of the Secretary of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, it is shown that at the beginning of the year there were 2,076 inmates, and that there were admitted during the year in addition 655, making a total of 2,731 under treatment.

During the year there were 226 deaths, 235 were discharged recovered, 77 improved, 17 unimproved, leaving on the records at the close of the year 2,177, divided as follows: Army, 847; Navy, 123; Marine-Hospital Service, 31; from civil life, 1,175.

As this institution cares for the District insane and transient insane at Washington, which constitute more than one-half of the total number, and as the population of the institution is constantly increasing, it seems apparent that there is not sufficient room for the Philippine soldiers there at the present time nor will there be on its completion.

The natural increment will, by the time the improvements are completed, tax its full capacity.

Unfortunately this asylum is near the Potomac Flats. The death rate at the institution is about 10 per cent per annum.

The vital statistics of the census of 1900 show the following mortality in the respective localities per thousand of population: District of Columbia, 23.65; Baltimore, 23; Cincinnati, 21; Chicago, 19; Buffalo, 18; Allegheny, 18; Los Angeles, 20; Oakland, 18.80; Stockton, 10.12. The last three points in California are those to which invalids go to recuperate and prolong their lives, and in consequence a higher mortality is shown. In point of climate and salubrity no argument is needed for California. The per capita cost of maintenance of a patient per annum in the asylum here is \$220; in California it is about \$150. It costs \$70 in railroad fare to bring an insane soldier from California to the asylum here, not counting the cost of the guard accompanying. Fifty-three per cent recover their faculties in four months. In such a case it will be seen that the cost of railroad fare is \$70 and the cost of cure \$72. This of course leaves out of consideration the cost of the guard who brings the patient to Washington. My information is that 75 per cent or thereabouts get permanently well.

Public duty, it seems to me, calls upon us to care for and cure these soldiers in California, not at the per capita cost at Washington of \$220, but at the per capita of \$150.

Every consideration that appeals to heart and mind calls upon us to do it.

In the last Congress the junior Senator from Maine, Senator HALE, introduced a bill, which was favorably reported by the senior Senator from California, Senator PERKINS, for the Naval Committee, and which passed that body, authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to care for the insane of the Navy and the Marine Corps in the asylums of California. Why has it not been done? It is right.

Every consideration, every reason, patriotic, financial, economic, appeals to the hearts and the minds of the American people not to permit a poor, unfortunate, insane soldier to be dragged across the continent 3,000 miles, from our most salubrious climate, and that man wearing the uniform of an American soldier.

I hope the chairman of the committee, I hope the members of his committee, I hope Congress, will see that those 100 insane from the Philippine Islands each year are cared for in that beautiful and salubrious climate of California. That great State stands ready with her institutions to care for the insane and unfortunate of our Army. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, as I understand, there was a law enacted at the last session of Congress—I am so informed, though I have no recollection of it—permitting the treatment of insane soldiers at any State or other institution. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The bill to which the gentleman refers was Senate bill 5238. It gave the Secretary of the Navy authority to contract for the care, maintenance, and treatment of the insane of the Navy and Marine Corps on the Pacific coast at any asylum in the State of California. That bill passed the Senate, but did not pass this House.

Mr. CANNON. I was under the impression that such legislation had been enacted.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I am sorry that the bill did not

become a law. I think there would be no objection to it if it were brought up here. I simply rose to call the attention of the gentleman and his committee to the condition that prevails, and if the gentleman will allow me to trespass a moment further on his courtesy I will say that I believe it will be ascertained on inquiry at the insane asylum here that there is no objection to that measure whatever.

Mr. CANNON. In my judgment, whether the law passed or not, it is quite in the power of the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to have the soldiers or sailors treated by contract. If that is not the law, it ought to be, and I am informed by one who is much more familiar with the legislation that has been enacted than I am that such a provision passed, probably on the Army and Navy bill. If it is not the law, the Committee on Appropriations has no jurisdiction. If it is the law, then the Army and Navy appropriation bill would carry the appropriation.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I simply wanted to emphasize the condition that prevailed where these soldiers are brought clear across our country, with all their misfortunes, adding to their ailments as it must, and that the asylum people here and the authorities say they are so crowded that they would gladly welcome that kind of legislation.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I have no objection to my friend's emphasizing what he desires to say in the premises. I quite sympathize with him, but, after all, a little bit of action, if any is needed, is worth a good deal of emphasis.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pumping station, pipe, etc., \$11,000.

Mr. CANNON. I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 104 strike out the lines 7 and 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "For increase and betterment of the water supply, \$6,000."

Mr. CANNON. I offer this at the request of the board of managers.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, \$584,500.

Mr. CANNON. I desire to correct the total, and I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 104, in line 19, strike out "eighty-four" and insert "seventy-nine."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For new boilers, \$3,500.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 105, after line 15, insert "for guard barrack, \$7,000."

Mr. CANNON. I will state that the Board of Managers desire the appropriation.

Mr. STEELE. It was estimated for, and the Board earnestly urged it. It was overlooked in the printing of the bill, I suppose. It is very desirable that in that climate we should have this barrack, because they have no convenience of the kind whatever, and it is very hard for as old soldiers as they are to get from their barracks at all times to a headquarters where the guard must be distributed or assigned to stations.

Mr. CANNON. The committee left it out. It is estimated for, it is true. The committee left out an additional barrack that was estimated for at Leavenworth, for the reason that your committee was satisfied with the construction of the Home in Tennessee, that all parties that are entitled to be cared for would in the future be properly cared for; but I will not antagonize the amendment as the Board of Managers are of the opinion that the service at this point requires the barrack.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I would state about the barrack that it is believed that the Home now building at Johnson City, Tenn., and additional barracks at Togus, Me., and one at Leavenworth, they really ought to have, we will be able to take care for the next two years, provided the increase does not largely exceed what it has been in the last two years, of all soldiers coming to us, but this is more in reply to propositions for the building of new Homes than it is in reply to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations; but the barracks suggested are really needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For extension of electric-light plant, \$7,500.

Mr. CURTIS. I offer the following amendment, which I will ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out, in line 16, page 108, the word "seven" and insert in lieu thereof the word "eleven."

Mr. CURTIS. This is recommended by the Board of Managers. They say they can not erect a plant for \$7,500.

Mr. STEELE. We have attempted to make contracts within the amount, but could not do it. It is absolutely necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 108, line 17, after the word "dollars," insert "for extension of boiler house, to be immediately available, \$7,500."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. I also offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 108, after the last amendment, insert "for additional boiler, \$6,500."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For one combined barrack, \$40,000.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I understand the Board of Managers are of opinion that this barrack ought to be constructed.

Mr. STEELE. The Leavenworth Home is in the center of a very large soldier population—taking them from New Mexico and Colorado and other points in the far West and Southwest—and I think it is in all respects desirable that we should have additional accommodations there. It is on about the same footing with Togus, Me.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to state further that the Home has been overcrowded for the last five or six years. The officers of the Home all claim that this additional barrack is needed.

Mr. STEELE. I will say to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that there is an additional reason why this kind of a barrack should be constructed. It is for the purpose of caring for the older men, who are unable to go to the dining room. It is practically an addition to the hospital, but at the same time it will make room in the barracks for newcomers to the Home.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to just say a single word touching this appropriation, recommended, as it is, by the Board and also by the gentleman from Kansas. I shall not antagonize by my vote the appropriation for the construction of this additional barrack at Leavenworth. I want to say, however, that after much inquiry I am thoroughly satisfied that with the construction of this barrack and the completion of the Home in Tennessee, that the accommodations will be ample for all the soldier population in the future. I was of opinion, and your committee were of opinion, that this barrack should not be constructed at the Leavenworth Home. I will not go into the condition at other places, but I do say that to my knowledge there is ample room for many hundreds of soldiers in quarters already constructed and not occupied; but I defer in my judgment about it to the judgment of the Board and the gentleman from Indiana, a member of it, and withdraw any opposition to the construction of this additional barrack, expressing again the belief, that amounts to a conviction, that all who are entitled to relief under the law are and will be fully provided for in the construction of the Home in Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For household, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, and for necessary expenses for the procurement, piping, and preservation of natural gas, \$25,000.

Mr. STEELE. I move to insert after the word "gas," in line 18, the words "oil, and water."

Under the present law we may procure natural gas by purchase, or drill gas wells, but we are also digging artesian wells in our country from which artesian water is sometimes obtained, and in some of the wells which are drilling for gas the gas is followed by oil, and we want this proviso in order to take care of those commodities as we find them in our own wells in desirable qualities and quantities.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For repairs, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, and for necessary expenses for the procurement, piping, and preservation of natural gas, \$25,000: *Provided*, That no part of the appropriations for repairs for any of the Branch Homes shall be used for the construction of any new building.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, after the word "gas," at the end of line 2, I desire to offer the same amendment that I offered a moment ago, to insert the words "oil, and water."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 111, after the word "gas," in line 2, insert "oil, and water."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For farm, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$10,000.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to add, after the words "Central Branch," in line 9, an amendment, which I ask the Clerk to report.

The amendment was read, as follows:

On page 111, after the words "Central Branch," in line 9, insert: "And for necessary expenses for the procurement, piping, and preservation of natural gas, oil, and water."

Mr. STEELE. I offer that for the same reason that I offered the other.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the Danville Branch, Danville, Ill.: For current expenses, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$31,750.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to that section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 111, lines 14 and 15, strike out "thirty-one thousand seven hundred and fifty" and insert "thirty-three thousand three hundred and fifty."

Mr. STEELE. That is in order to increase the appropriation \$1,600 to provide for a commissary who has not been appointed at that post yet, where one is needed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For hospital, including the same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$33,100.

Mr. STEELE. I move to strike out the word "one," the last word in line 23, and to insert the word "eight."

The amendment was read, as follows:

Page 111, line 23, strike out the word "one" and insert "eight," so that it will read, "\$33,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For clothing for all of the Branches, namely: Expenditures for clothing, underclothing, hats, caps, boots, shoes, socks, and overalls; also all sums expended for labor, materials, machines, tools, and appliances employed, and for use in the tailor shops, knitting shops, and shoe shops, or other Home shops in which any kind of clothing is made or repaired, \$300,000.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I did not get to speak to the chairman of the committee, but there is a call for \$310,000 for clothing, instead of what is provided in the bill.

Mr. CANNON. We gave the estimates.

Mr. STEELE. You are \$10,000 less than their estimates.

Mr. CANNON. It may be that you did not submit their estimates. If this estimate is submitted—

Mr. STEELE. The treasurer of the Home called my attention to it a very short time ago, and said an additional amount would be necessary, because provision had not been made for the probable number of men taken into the Danville Home during the next fiscal year.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I will see. Three hundred thousand was estimated; but if the gentleman says that for clothing, etc., \$300,000 is not sufficient and that the board desires an additional \$10,000—

Mr. STEELE. Suppose you make it \$305,000?

Mr. CANNON. It is a question of what is needed.

Mr. STEELE. I am told that they would absolutely need \$310,000.

Mr. CANNON. Are you satisfied that \$310,000 would be required?

Mr. STEELE. That would be my judgment, on his estimates.

Mr. CANNON. Offer your amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers the following amendment, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 113, line 3, after the word "hundred," insert the words "and ten."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For president of the Board of Managers, \$4,000; secretary of the Board of Managers, \$2,000; general treasurer, who shall not be a member of the Board of Managers, \$4,000; inspector-general, \$2,500; assistant general treasurer and assistant inspector-general, \$2,000; two assistant inspectors-general, at \$2,000 each; clerical services for the offices of the president and general treasurer, \$10,000; messenger service for president's office, \$144; clerical services for managers, \$3,400; agents, \$1,800; for traveling expenses of the Board of Managers, their officers and employees, \$15,000; for outdoor relief, \$1,000; for rent, medical examinations, stationery, telegrams, and other incidental expenses, \$6,000; in all, \$55,844.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the committee to a few changes that have been requested and recommended by the Board of Managers. I talked with the subcommittee about it, but for some reason or other the matter was overlooked. I am in hopes it was an oversight on the part of the Board. It is desired to increase the salaries of the inspector-general and the assistant treasurer by \$500. They asked for \$1,000. This would be just the same as the other officers are paid. They do not only inspect the National Homes and keep the accounts of the National Homes, but they inspect and keep account of the various State Homes, some 26 in number, and this involves a great deal of work. Living as they must at headquarters, it is very expensive. So that I do not believe that they have enough pay. I think they ought to have more, and I have asked for this amendment, and I hope there will be no objection to increasing the pay of these gentlemen to the extent suggested.

Mr. VANDIVER. How many are there?

Mr. STEELE. There is the inspector-general. His pay is \$2,500, and it is proposed to make it \$3,000. There are the assistant general treasurer and two assistant inspectors-general. Their salaries are each \$2,000, and it is proposed to make them \$2,500. I move that amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. I would like to ask the gentleman if these salaries are now fixed by law?

Mr. STEELE. The salaries are fixed, or may be fixed, by the board of managers. The appropriations are made by Congress.

Mr. BARTLETT. I ask if the law does not prescribe the amount of the salary.

Mr. CANNON. It only dwells in appropriation bills, as I understand.

Mr. STEELE. That is all.

Mr. BARTLETT. You say the law does not fix the salary of these officers?

Mr. STEELE. Congress only makes the appropriation.

Mr. CANNON. Only as they are appropriated for. The gentleman from Indiana, I understand, now proposes to increase the salary of the inspector-general from \$2,500 to \$3,000.

Mr. STEELE. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. And the assistant general's treasurer and assistant inspector-general from \$2,000 to \$2,500?

Mr. STEELE. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. Two assistant inspectors-general from \$2,000 to \$2,500?

Mr. STEELE. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. Do you offer this amendment?

Mr. STEELE. Yes, sir; I will offer this amendment. This was presented to the committee by the board.

Mr. CANNON. The matter was presented to the Committee on Appropriations and heard, and your committee did not follow your recommendation to increase the salaries, although I will confess that the recommendations made by the Board of Managers touching the administration of this fund have very great influence with me. We have not followed the policy in this bill of increasing salaries. In fact, it is not a salary bill. We did not report the recommendation; and still I want to be entirely fair with the Committee of the Whole, and if the gentleman for the board insists on this increase with the statement of fact I have said all I desire to say about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 113, line 11, strike out "two" and insert the word "three;" and, after the word "thousand," strike out the words "five hundred," so that it will read "\$3,000." In line 12, after the word "thousand," insert the words "five hundred;" and, in line 13, after the word "thousand," insert "five hundred."

Mr. STEELE. And, in line 15, after the word "thousand," insert "five hundred."

The Clerk read as follows:

And, in line 15, after the word "thousand," insert the words "five hundred."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter the officers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, and of the Board of Managers thereof, shall be appointed, so far as may be practicable, from persons whose military or naval service would

render them eligible, if disabled and not otherwise provided for, for admission to the Home, and they may be appointed, removed, and transferred from time to time, as the interests of the institution may require, by the Board of Managers.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to reserve a point of order on this paragraph so that the matter may be explained. I do not quite understand it.

Mr. STEELE. We now admit to the National Home soldiers of the Mexican war, volunteer soldiers of the civil war, soldiers of the Regular Army who were disabled during the war or who became disabled after the war, and lately, by the action of Congress, we admit soldiers of the Spanish war. Now the object of this legislation is to enable the board, if it so desires, to make officers out of soldiers of the Spanish war as we now do out of soldiers of the other wars. On account of the age of some of the present incumbents, the necessity for this legislation must become more apparent every day.

Mr. PARKER. May I ask whether this matter was brought up by the board at the meeting of the Appropriations Committee. I can not find any proceedings on the subject in the report of the hearing.

Mr. STEELE. It certainly was.

Mr. CANNON. I do not recollect whether the hearings were reported or not, but this subject was certainly considered. We had an extended hearing on the subject.

Mr. PARKER. Then, as I understand, the object of this provision is to enable the board of managers to appoint as officers veterans of the Spanish war.

Mr. STEELE. If so desired.

Mr. PARKER. To enable the board of managers to appoint, if so desired, veterans of the Spanish war as officers, instead of being confined, as now, to veterans of the civil war?

Mr. STEELE. Yes, sir.

Mr. PARKER. May I ask also whether the provision for transfer from one Home to another is not entirely new?

Mr. STEELE. No; it is not new.

Mr. PARKER. I have not found that word in the old statute.

Mr. STEELE. For instance, we may now send soldiers to the asylum here—

Mr. PARKER. I am speaking of officers. The language of the bill is that—

Hereafter officers may be appointed, removed, and transferred, from time to time.

Mr. STEELE. That is to provide for a case of this kind: Suppose we have an officer who is well qualified and is doing duty in a certain Home and we establish a new Home, we may wish to transfer him to that new Home.

Mr. PARKER. But this word "transfer" is new in the statute?

Mr. STEELE. Yes, sir.

Mr. PARKER. I am only endeavoring to bring out an explanation for the benefit of the House. Although this matter may not have been brought up before the Committee on Military Affairs as it should strictly have been as a general provision with reference to Soldiers' Homes, I have no desire to obstruct by a point of order any legislation that may be desired by the Board of Managers of the Soldiers' Homes. Therefore, in view of the explanation which has been made, I withdraw the point of order.

The clerk read as follows:

Defense of suits before Spanish Treaty Claims Commission: For salaries and expenses in defense of claims before the Spanish Treaty Claims Commission, including salaries of Assistant Attorney-General in charge as fixed by law, and of assistant attorneys and necessary employees in Washington or elsewhere, to be selected and their compensation fixed by the Attorney-General, to be expended under his direction, so much of the provisions of the act of March 2, 1901, providing for the Spanish Treaty Claims Commission as are in conflict herewith notwithstanding, \$80,000.

Mr. CANNON. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 3, on page 117, strike out "60" and insert "112," so as to read \$112,000.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the necessity for this amendment is fully set out in a letter from the Attorney-General, which I will ask to have inserted in my remarks, not taking time to have it read, unless some member desires that it should be.

The letter referred to by Mr. CANNON is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D. C., March, 29, 1902.

The CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I send you a copy of a letter I wrote to-day to the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an estimate for an increase in the amount originally estimated as necessary for the defense of suits before the Spanish Treaty Claims Commission for the fiscal year 1903 from \$80,000 to \$112,000, and have the honor to request that the sundry civil bill, in which this appropriation of \$80,000 is included as reported to the House, be amended so as to appropriate \$112,000. I will be glad to give you additional information as to the reasons for this increase in the appropriation if you think it necessary.

Respectfully,

P. C. KNOX, Attorney-General.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D. C., March 29, 1902.

The SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

SIR: I have the honor to request that a proper estimate be submitted to Congress for an increase in the amount to be provided for the defense of suits before the Spanish Treaty Claims Commission for the fiscal year 1903 from \$30,000, as requested by my letter to you of December 9, 1901, and as now provided in the sundry civil bill as reported to the House of Representatives, to \$112,000.

When the original estimate of December 9, 1901, was made the matter of the defense of suits had not progressed far enough, nor had work enough been done, nor the character of that work sufficiently developed to give the Department proper data upon which to base a correct estimate, that of \$80,000 being tentative.

To enable the Department to do the work anticipated during the coming year will probably require several additional assistant attorneys in Cuba and possibly one in Spain. The amount needed for obtaining testimony, paying witnesses, traveling expenses, and commissioners' fees in the United States, Spain, and Cuba can not be estimated with accuracy, but it is evident that the taking of testimony in Spain and in Cuba, with 400 cases on the docket for trial, will be large. I think it preferable to have a proper appropriation made at the outset rather than to have to call for a deficiency early in the session.

Respectfully,

Attorney-General.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. I ask that the Clerk may correct the totals in accordance with the amendments that have been made.

There was no objection.

Mr. PEARRE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 4, page 117, after the word "dollars," add the following new paragraph:

"To enable the Secretary of War to reimburse George W. Dant for such expenses incurred by him in legal proceedings growing out of the Ford's Theater disaster on the 9th day of June, 1893, as the Secretary of War may decide to have been necessary, proper, and reasonable, \$3,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. CANNON. I will reserve a point of order on that proposition.

Mr. PEARRE. Mr. Chairman, I am not distinctly clear whether this is the proper place in the bill at which this amendment should be offered, except on the general theory that the Government of the United States is presumed to be continually pursuing the general public work or object of doing justice to its citizens. If, however, this appears not to be the appropriate place, I will, after the bill has been read, ask unanimous consent to turn back to the items under the head of the War Department, in order that—

Mr. CANNON. I make no point of order as to the place at which it is proposed to insert the proposition. If the Committee of the Whole should adopt the amendment, it can be inserted in the appropriate place. The point I make has reference to the merits.

Mr. PEARRE. Now, Mr. Chairman, as is well known, this whole community was shocked on the 9th of June, 1893, by a singularly fatal accident in connection with the collapse of Ford's old theater in this city, located on Tenth street between E and F streets NW. It had become necessary, it appears, in order to improve the electric lighting apparatus of that building, which was at that time used by the Government of the United States for the office of the Record and Pension Division of the War Department, to make certain excavations under or near the outer cellar wall, in order that the new electric lighting apparatus might be accommodated.

The Government asked for proposals for bids, bids were offered, and the successful bidder was George W. Dant, of the District of Columbia. The work to be done was a work of excavation, and he then became the general contractor to do the work. He, however, let out by subcontracts a great deal of this work and different portions of this work to other parties, each one of these contractors, under the proposals for the bids, being not under the control of Mr. Dant, the original contractor, but under the absolute control of officers who had charge of the building, namely, General Ainsworth, M. R. Thorp, chief of the supply division, and Mr. Sasse.

General Ainsworth had general charge of the building and of the work as Chief of the Record and Pension Division of the War Department. Mr. Thorp had charge of the building and was in the building itself, being a subordinate officer to General Ainsworth. Mr. Sasse was another subordinate officer to General Ainsworth, and was connected with the personal supervision of the excavations made by the subcontractors under their subcontracts with Mr. Dant, the general contractor. A clause in the proposals reads as follows:

All earth excavated must be removed at once and no accumulation of dirt allowed in or about the building. All excavation must be done at such times and in such manner as the officer in charge of the building may direct, in order that the work of underpinning and building walls may be safely and properly done.

It will appear from that section of the proposal for bids (which of course became a part of the contract and was written into the contract between the Government and George W. Dant, general

contractor) that the supervision and control of the whole work was placed in the hands of the officer having charge of the building and took it out of the hands of Mr. Dant, the general contractor, for the reason, as given in this section of the proposal, that the work might be "safely and properly done." Now, sir, in this excavation, which was made by a gentleman named Pullman, who was the subcontractor to do the excavating, the walls, it seems, were improperly taken out and the building collapsed and fell. There were 500 Government clerks in the building at the time and the loss of life and injury to limb was very great. The disaster was appalling. That the blame rested upon the Government was absolutely palpable and provable beyond question, and Congress very shortly began to make provision for the injured and the dead.

By the sundry civil bill of March 2, 1895, a commission was appointed to investigate the injuries and deaths caused by the collapse of this building, the Government thereby recognizing its liability, which of course was beyond contradiction. On the 11th day of May, 1896, a Senate committee, with Senator Faulkner as chairman of that committee, reported and recommended the payment of sums of money ranging from small amounts of \$500, in case of injury, up to \$5,000, in cases of death, the total recommendation of appropriations being over \$75,000. Indictments were prepared, in response to what appeared to be a general public demand, against General Ainsworth, Mr. Thorp, Mr. Sasse, and Mr. Dant. Those indictments were demurred to by the attorneys for General Ainsworth and Mr. Dant, and the demurrers were overruled by the supreme bench of the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PEARRE. I would like to ask the gentleman [Mr. CANNON] to give me time to complete this short statement. I will confine myself to the facts.

Mr. CANNON. I have no objection. It is quite within the discretion of the Chair. It is on a point of order. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. PEARRE. Five or six minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that his time may be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEARRE. Those demurrers, as I said, were overruled by the supreme bench of the District of Columbia. They were then taken upon appeal to the court of appeals of the District of Columbia, where the ruling of the supreme bench was sustained. New indictments were prepared, from which, however, the names of Mr. Thorp and Mr. Sasse were omitted, charging Colonel Ainsworth and Mr. Dant with manslaughter. These indictments were again demurred to and the demurrer sustained by the supreme bench of the District of Columbia, under the ruling of the court of appeals in the previous case, and an appeal was again taken by the district attorney to the court of appeals, and the court of appeals sustained their original ruling and held the demurrers good, thus determining, under correct legal process, that there was no criminal liability upon either Colonel Ainsworth, Mr. Sasse, Mr. Thorp, or Mr. Dant, the beneficiary of this proposed appropriation. The sundry civil bill, which was approved by the President of the United States on March 2, 1895, contains an appropriation for General Ainsworth, as follows:

To enable the Secretary of War to reimburse Col. F. C. Ainsworth, Chief of the Record and Pension Division of the War Department, for such expense incurred by him in legal proceedings growing out of the Ford Theater disaster on the 9th of June, 1893, as the Secretary of War may decide to have been necessary, proper, and reasonable, \$4,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

This clause is contained in the sundry civil bill appropriating \$4,000 to reimburse Colonel Ainsworth for all expenses to which he had been subjected on account of these prosecutions, which had been improvidently and incorrectly instituted against Colonel Ainsworth, as the courts decided. Mr. Dant stood upon exactly the same ground, or upon a better ground, than Colonel Ainsworth, because under the very proposal for bids the work of the subcontractor, Pullman, was placed under the supervision, not of Mr. Dant, the general contractor, but under the supervision of Colonel Ainsworth himself, in order that the Government might provide against the very calamity that subsequently happened.

General Ainsworth having been provided for by the appropriation of \$4,000, and each one of the victims of this awful disaster or their families having been reimbursed, certainly in part, this amendment proposes nothing but a simple proposition of elementary justice—that the same measure of compensation and reimbursement as has been measured out to others injured either directly or indirectly by the collapse of this building—for which the Government was responsible—should be measured out also to George W. Dant; and I respectfully submit, sir, that the Congress of the United States can not well afford to place itself in the position of making flesh of one and fish of the other and authoriz-

ing an appropriation of \$4,000 to an official of the United States Army connected with one of the departments of the Government who had absolute control and charge of this work under the very contracts under which it was done and yet fail to reimburse George W. Dant, equally injured, much less responsible, and much less liable in every sense than Colonel Ainsworth.

I submit that the Government of the United States, through its Congress, can not well afford to place itself in the position of sustaining such an injustice, and I confidently submit the matter to the House, believing that this appropriation ought to be and will be made.

Mr. CANNON. I think it is necessary for me only to say that by the gentleman's statement this claim has no legal status and is therefore subject to the point of order. I might go further and say I am inclined to think it has no moral status, but that is a matter that might come up if it should ever be reported from the Committee on Claims for the consideration of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule on the point of order. At the second session of the Fifty-sixth Congress it was held that it is not in order to appropriate on an appropriation bill for an unadjudicated claim, even though it be transmitted to the House by an Executive message.

There are several rulings which hold that propositions to pay private claims against the Government are not in order on general appropriation bills. There seems to be a long line of decisions covering the point, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Prosecution of crimes: For the detection and prosecution of crimes against the United States, preliminary to indictment; the investigation of official acts, records, and accounts of marshals, attorneys, clerks of the United States courts, and United States commissioners, for which purpose all the records and dockets of said officers, without exception, shall be examined by the agents of the Attorney-General at any time; the inspection of United States prisoners and prisons; to be expended under the direction of the Attorney-General, and to include salaries of all necessary agents in Washington, D. C., \$45,000.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, a short time ago I called to the attention of the committee the bringing across the country of the insane soldiers from the Philippine Islands. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has since called my attention to the fact that an appropriation had been made and warrant given in appropriation bills in the last Congress authorizing the Secretaries of War and the Navy to provide for the care of these insane soldiers on the Pacific coast.

Those who have read the sorrowful tales that were told of these travels of the insane, 100 a year from the Philippine Islands, would scarcely have thought that a law of that kind was already upon the statute books. I did not know it until reminded of it after the former debate. I believe it was placed on the appropriation bills in the Senate, only evidencing again that we sometimes look to the Senate for the wisest legislation.

I gave the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] credit, as I always do, for his generosity of heart, and I knew the Committee on Appropriations would do its duty. I had no information that this had been done a year ago. But what I said with reference to the soldiers a few moments ago should appeal with equal force to the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War, who now have the authority to do this and who may save the expense of \$70 for each insane soldier who comes here, that being the amount which the railroads get for transporting him to Washington, and do a grace to not only the soldiers, but to the American people.

I see that the next Secretary of the Navy [Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts] is in the room, participating in this debate, managing in part this bill, one who is esteemed by both sides of the House as but few men have been esteemed, and I know that it will enter his heart to carry out the provisions of the law that I shall have read from the Clerk's desk if it be within his power, if it be compatible with the public interests. I hope that my statement here, calling this matter to his attention, will result in these soldiers being cared for 3,000 miles closer to the scene of their misfortune, and where they will have that treatment, that climate, and that care that they so richly deserve of a generous Government, because of the misfortune that has come to them while fighting under the American flag.

I ask the Clerk to read from the law upon the subject, first from the United States Statutes at Large, volume 31, page 1163, the sundry civil appropriation bill of 1901, approved March 3, 1901.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of War may, in his discretion, contract for the care, maintenance, and treatment of the insane of the Army, and inmates of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers on the Pacific coast at any State asylum in California, in all cases which he is now authorized by law to cause to be sent to the Government Hospital for the Insane in the District of Columbia.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. And from the Navy appropriation bill, the same volume 31, page 1123, the Navy appropriation bill approved March 3, 1901.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the care, maintenance, and treatment of the insane of the Navy and Marine Corps on the Pacific coast, and all other necessary contingent expenses, \$35,000.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, a single word. How many, under the provisions referred to, insane sailors and soldiers have been cared for at the Soldiers' Home at Santa Monica and the State asylum of California I do not know; nor do I know whether other State insane asylums have the capacity to treat the insane referred to; nor do I know whether it would in all cases be humane to have them treated upon the Pacific coast. Take a soldier of the gentleman's own district, to illustrate, returned from the Philippine Islands insane, treated on the Pacific coast, and, if he recovers, discharged.

I am not sure but what the soldier's relatives would much prefer that he be removed to St. Elizabeth's and treated there. I only refer to this. I think it was wise to grant discretion; but I am not at all prepared to say that that discretion has not been exercised with wisdom. I do not know what the facts are, but I could conceive of many cases where humanity would dictate that they should be brought to St. Elizabeth's rather than treated on the Pacific coast.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. If I may interrupt the gentleman, I cordially agree with what the gentleman has stated all along on that subject at this time. I had inquired into this important subject at St. Elizabeth's Insane Asylum in the city of Washington, and I was not aware, and the authorities did not seem to know, that any arrangements had been made or law passed with reference to the Army insane, but on the contrary it was stated that they would have been entirely satisfied with arrangements in line with the suggestion that I made.

In addition to that, since speaking on the floor this morning I have seen the senior Senator from California, who had requested that this law be put in operation, and that the same had been promised, so that I rather think that it was an oversight on the part of the departments, for surely their patriotic hearts would do the best, and if in their opinion it is better to have it provided that the soldiers be cared for in California they will do it cheerfully and promptly.

Mr. CANNON. Read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insular and territorial affairs: For defraying the necessary expenses incurred in the conduct of insular and other territorial matters and affairs within the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice, including the payment of necessary employees at the seat of government or elsewhere, to be selected and their compensation fixed by the Attorney-General, and to be expended under his direction, \$25,000.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Here is another reminder of the fact that this country has gone into the colonial business. Twenty-five thousand dollars to be expended in the colonies, nobody knows what for, so nothing is said about it. Our possessions abroad bob up in this fashion whenever we have under consideration a general appropriation bill. First came the urgent deficiency bill with an appropriation of \$500,000. As one by one the general appropriation bills appear each carries an appropriation of money to be expended in this new venture, and so the total is amounting to many millions. A peculiarity of all these appropriations is that they are vague and indefinite as to what the money is to be expended for. The Committee on Appropriations has no difficulty whatever in prescribing, item by item, the sums to be expended in the various departments of the Government at home. Not so in the colonies.

As showing the impossibility of systematic, decent, orderly administration in our colonial possessions, these appropriations speak volumes. What is to be done with the money nobody knows, so in comes an omnibus provision vesting in somebody power somehow to spend so much money for indefinite purposes. This is only one of the peculiarities of these appropriations. Another is that nobody has told us definitely what the taxpayers may expect in return. I have never heard an answer to the question propounded on this floor repeatedly, How is the country to be compensated for this great outlay? How are we to receive a return upon the investment? Who is being benefited by the outlay of so much cash? We are not benefiting the Filipinos. We are killing them by hundreds. We are not benefiting the commerce of the United States.

Every country that trades with the Philippine Islands has made gains greater than the United States since the war began there. Early in the discussion, nearly two years ago, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], in an outburst of adulation and praise of his party for the great conquests in the Orient, declared that it was our purpose to hold to these outlying possessions, and that incidentally we were going to make what money could be made out of them—a shock to the intelligence of the country, doubtless, for I believe that no considerable

number of our people are willing to go to war for plunder and profit.

But waiving all this, the profits have not been forthcoming and are not in sight. We have been told that the islands are enormously rich. That is true, doubtless. But what does rich mean? The riches of a country consist of its resources, its productiveness; and the Philippines are very productive, but what good does that do us? We refuse to avail ourselves of their productiveness. The Republicans on the Committee on Ways and Means have been wrangling for two months in an effort to shut out of our markets Cuban sugar and tobacco. It is because the Philippines produce these commodities that they are called rich. What of it? You will not allow them to exchange these commodities for American goods. Thus, when the products of our insular possessions are offered to us, we shut the door in the face of our vassal races. If we would trade with them, possibly our vassals might be of some advantage to the country. But we will not allow them access to our markets.

When the little island of Porto Rico came under our dominion, which I was heartily in favor of, it was said that it was the most prolific island in the West Indies; but instantly the Republican party declared that we could not afford to permit the little island to send its products here. So they say concerning Cuba. As to the Philippine Islands, we are told that enough sugar could be grown over there to glut the markets of the world. If that is true, then the Philippine Islands are rich. All we have to do is to open our markets to them, and our people would receive this sugar and give them commodities in exchange for it. But we put up a Chinese wall and avoid this exchange. Tell me, then, how are we to avail ourselves of the riches of which you have boasted?

Is it not a little remarkable that we should possess ourselves of islands of great natural wealth and resources and then put prohibitive tariffs on their productions? What is commerce but reciprocal trade? If we say to the Filipinos, "Thus far and no farther shall you develop your trade with us," we say to the American producer, "Thus far and no farther may you go in developing your trade with the Filipinos."

I can not conceive of anything more ridiculous and absurd than such a position. Send armies abroad to conquer countries because they are productive, violate the Constitution of our country in the manner of their government, trample its provisions under foot, all in the name of expanding commerce, and then, when commerce would expand, manacle the limbs of our traders, build up a wall about the subject peoples we have conquered by violence, and declare that no trade expansion shall take place. Having done this, the Republican majority brings in appropriation bill after appropriation bill, vague and indefinite in their terms, and, in the aggregate, amounting to many millions, and ask the American taxpayers to go down into their pockets and foot the bills—all for the purpose of building up a great trade in the Philippines! [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For payment of regular assistants to United States district attorneys who are appointed by the Attorney-General, at a fixed compensation, \$185,000.

Mr. MANN. I move to strike out the last word. I wish to make an inquiry of my colleague [Mr. CANNON] about these items in reference to the pay of assistant district attorneys. I see here is an item of \$435,000 for "district attorneys and their regular assistants." Then there is another item "for payment of regular assistants to United States district attorneys" \$185,000. What is the difference between the salaries of the regular assistants?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman has not read the language of the bill closely. The first clause is:

For salaries of United States district attorneys and expenses of United States district attorneys and their regular assistants, \$435,000.

That is, the expenses of those two classes of officers—district attorneys and their assistants. The other paragraph is:

For payment of regular assistants to United States district attorneys, who are appointed by the Attorney-General, at a fixed annual compensation, \$185,000.

The gentleman notices the difference in the language?

Mr. MANN. I notice that the language is susceptible of two constructions. That is the reason I asked the question.

Mr. CANNON. I hardly think that the language admits of two constructions.

Mr. MANN. What I wished to inquire was what the two items were for—whether the first item included salaries of district attorneys.

Mr. CANNON. No, the language is: "Expenses of United States district attorneys and their regular assistants." Now the next item is "for payment of regular assistants to United States district attorneys who are appointed by the Attorney-General at a fixed annual compensation."

Mr. MANN. Are they all appointed by the Attorney-General?

Mr. CANNON. I think all the assistants are so appointed, but the district attorneys are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. MANN. Of course. While I am on the floor may I ask the gentleman in reference to the item beginning on line 16—"for fees of clerks, \$340,000?" Is the gentleman able to inform us exactly in reference to the compensation of these clerks?

Mr. CANNON. Under an amendment made to the law two or three years ago the fees go into the Treasury and appropriations are made for the payment of the salaries, which, according to my recollections, do not exceed \$2,500. It is my recollection—I may be mistaken; perhaps I am not as familiar with this matter as I ought to be—that the law was revised under the lead of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY].

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Updegraff.

Mr. CANNON. Yes, it was Mr. Updegraff, then a member from Iowa.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Public Printer is authorized hereafter to procure and supply, on the requisition of the head of any Executive Department or other Government establishment, complete manifold blanks, books, and forms, required in duplicating processes; also complete patented devices with which to file money-order statements, or other uniform official papers, and to charge such supplies to the allotment for printing and binding of the Department or Government establishment requiring the same.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations what has happened since 1895 to raise this appropriation for public printing and binding \$2,504,000 to \$5,297,000, nearly doubling it in five years?

Mr. CANNON. The expenditure for public printing and binding depends purely upon legislation by Congress and the amount of work that is ordered by Congress and the growth of the public service as registered in the Executive Departments. Take the Post-Office Department, for instance. The growth is wonderful. So it is all along the line of the public service. When you come to Congress proper, the growth of printing for the use of the House and all its members individually and collectively and of the Senate has been very extraordinary, and this registers, I will say again, the growth of the country, and, I was going to say, the extravagance of Congress, but I will not say that.

Mr. PALMER. That is what I want you to say.

Mr. CANNON. Then there is something of growth in the increase of wages of Government employees—20 per cent increase, as I recollect, in the Government Printing Office alone, in wages. There has been something of an advance probably in five years in material. Consideration is given, I have no doubt, for all these expenditures, and the only way to cut it down is by the economy of the House and the Senate.

Mr. PALMER. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not think it is pretty near time to call a halt?

Mr. CANNON. Well, I have been trying to call a halt, as one member of this committee, in these expenditures for many, many years, but the committee will not halt. I would welcome any effort on the part of my friends. [Laughter.]

Mr. PALMER. I am simply inquiring for the purpose of seeking information. I want to inquire if the gentleman does not think that about three-fourths of all the stuff that is printed is practically unnecessary and useless?

Mr. CANNON. Well, I should hardly say that. I believe there is much of printing of documents that is unnecessary. You have got to print all that are ordered, of course. I think many documents are printed under the law where a less number might well be printed, much of printing that from my standpoint is useless, and if I had my way about it there would not be much of printing I think in connection with the House except that what my friend says and what I say. [Laughter.] But there are about 360 others.

Mr. PALMER. You do not think you and I monopolize all the sense there is here, do you?

Mr. CANNON. Well, I don't know that it would be modest for me to answer that question.

Mr. PALMER. Well, whenever you want to call a halt, you have one recruit, I will say that.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, if I might offer a suggestion, I have been advised by men who are familiar with the workings of the Printing Office that a very large part of the unnecessary expense of that department grows out of inefficient editorial work in the departments, due partly to lack of training on the part of those who prepare the copy, and partly to dilatoriness on their part. Proofs will be sent out and will not be returned for weeks, and there are at times tons of type tied up on the imposing stones of the Printing Office waiting the return of proofs, and if there could be any reform brought about in the matter of the editorial force of the various departments it would save one of the largest leaks in the Printing Office.

Mr. CANNON. Well, there is something of well-founded complaint along that line. There has been a constant contest and always will be, no doubt. I recollect that some years ago that one of the bureaus of the War Department made quite a report on the subject of botany, and we tried to cut that out by the roots, and, I think, succeeded, but every once in a while it crops out. Then, once in a while, we have some zealous Representative or Senator—and I will not speak of a Senator as such—that is wonderfully industrious, and sometimes fills more pages of the RECORD than my friend or I would think wise; but after all it may be wise to remember that the growth of this appropriation in large part shows the growth of the country and the growth of the public service. Let me give the gentleman one instance upon these monographs of the Agricultural Department. I recollect in the name of our good farmer friends—and I am a farmer myself—we doubled, if not trebled, that appropriation, and there you are. We have to act here. The House and the Senate have control of the whole shooting match, so that we can not shift the responsibility onto the shoulders of somebody else touching this expenditure.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the Clerk will be given permission to correct the totals of the bill.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with the amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LAWRENCE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13123) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, and with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded upon any amendment? If not the Chair will submit them to the House in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CANNON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of Senate bill 1025, to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 1025) to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service, with Mr. OLMSTED in the chair.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] for five minutes. Will that be as much time as the gentleman cares for?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN] yields to the gentleman from Georgia five minutes.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I regret that, owing to a deep-seated and very severe cold, I shall be unable to speak with comfort or satisfaction for any considerable length of time. After making one or two observations I shall yield back the remainder of the time which has been so courteously allotted to me.

I have heard very few objections to this bill. It is well known to everyone that before the Navy was created the Revenue-Cutter Service did our fighting in time of war, and that is the only time when the Army and Navy fight now, or ever fought.

In answer to our proposition that the officers of this service should be placed on an equal footing with the officers of the Navy we hear two objections. One is that it is not a fighting body, but a civil establishment, and the other is that the enactment of this legislation would be an entering wedge for a civil pension list. I believe that states the whole case of the opposition.

Now, in the first place, the Revenue-Cutter Service fights, and fights valiantly and gloriously when there is occasion, and has done so in every war. The fact that in times of peace it works in patrolling the coast and attending to the enforcement of our revenue laws is that much to its credit. The officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service do not frolic on land in time of peace, and in time of war they fight as much as anybody else, and more.

Now as to the other point, Is this an entering wedge to a civil pension list? I say no; the line of distinction is clear and marked. Those who bare their breasts to the storm of battle and wage their country's wars are entitled to pensions, and I stop here and now at that.

I yield back the balance of my time, and hope that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BELLAMY] will be afforded as much time as possible. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER].

Mr. SULZER. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I am sincerely in favor of this bill to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service, because, in my judgment, it is a just, a patriotic, and a meritorious measure. No fair-minded man who will take the trouble to carefully examine the history of the Revenue-Cutter Service of this Government will seriously oppose this bill on its merits. There is no brighter, no grander, no more self-sacrificing page in American history than that written by the heroic achievements and the commendable acts of the men in the Revenue-Cutter Service. They are entitled to all they ask for in this bill, which is nothing more or less than simple justice, and Congress will be false to every sentiment of gratitude if it denies their just demands.

The Revenue-Cutter Service was created by law at the very inception of the Government. It was established before the Department of the Navy, and for that reason it was made a part of the Treasury Department. But it is and always has been more military than civil. Investigation proves beyond question that in its organization, general features, military character, naval discipline, and duties the Revenue-Cutter Service is now and always has been constantly regarded as a part of the military service of the Government for both offensive and defensive operations; that it has taken an active and brilliant part in every war of this nation.

To go no further back than the war of 1898 with Spain, this Service was in that war from Manila to Cuba. To illustrate the conditions under which the Revenue-Cutter Service fought in that war, take the action off Cardenas, fought on May 11, 1898. The active forces engaged on that date on the American side against the shore batteries and gunboats at Cardenas were the gunboat *Wilmington*, the torpedo boat *Winslow*, and the revenue cutter *Hudson*, the latter serving by Executive order in cooperation with the Navy. What happened is best told in the following letter:

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Washington, D. C., June 15, 1898.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 9th instant and to forward herewith a copy of the report requested. I regret that inadvertently a copy of this letter was not forwarded to you immediately after it was received.

The rescue of the *Winslow* by the *Hudson* was so gallantly done, in the face of a most galling fire, that First Lieut. Frank H. Newcomb, Revenue-Cutter Service, commanding, his officers and men, deserve the warmest commendation.

The *Winslow* was riddled with shell, disabled, helplessly drifting onto the beach into the hands of the enemy, her captain wounded, her only other officer and half her crew killed, but the *Hudson* courageously remained by her in the very center of the hottest fire of the action, although in constant danger of going ashore on account of the shallow water, until finally a line was made fast to the *Winslow* and that vessel towed out of range of the enemy's guns.

Very respectfully,

JOHN D. LONG,
Secretary.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

The object of this illustration is to prove, if any such proof be necessary, that one service is subject to the same conditions and exposure in war as the other, while the provisions of law thrown around the one are studiously denied the other, and it is the object and purpose of this bill to correct these conditions. Who will say that the commander of the *Hudson* was not worthy of the emoluments received by the commander of the *Winslow*, by whose side he steadily fought throughout, and whose life and vessel he saved from destruction?

The history of the service from its organization in 1790, through all the wars of the nation, is replete with instances of heroism both in peace and in war. The first gun of the civil war on the Union side was fired from the deck of a revenue cutter (the *Harriet Lane*) and the first gun of the war with Spain at Manila Bay was fired from another (the *McCulloch*).

It is only necessary to read the history of the country to ascertain that the brave and gallant men of the Revenue-Cutter Service did heroic work in the Revolutionary war, in the war of 1812, in the Mexican war, in the Seminole war, in the civil war, and in the war with Spain. How can anyone successfully contend, in the face of these facts, that the Revenue-Cutter Service is more civic than military? The record answers. The Revenue-Cutter Service is as much a part of the military arm of the Government in time of war as the Marine Corps.

And, sir, if the officers of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps are entitled to rank, to longevity pay, and to retirement

after long and faithful service, then, in the name of justice and consistency, why should not the officers in the Revenue-Cutter Service be entitled to the same rights and to similar privileges?

Now, Mr. Chairman, what does this bill do? Very briefly, all that this bill does is to give to the men in the Revenue-Cutter Service rank. And how high rank? Only to the degree of a captain. By the terms of this bill no officer in the Revenue-Cutter Service can rise above the rank of captain or get a higher title than that of captain. The largest pay the highest officer in this service can receive is the same pay a lieutenant-commander in the Navy receives. Then this bill gives the Revenue-Cutter officers the right to be retired when they are old and physically incapacitated by wounds, exposure, and long service in all kinds of weather, in stress and in storm, in trial and in triumph, in sunshine and in rain, in peace and in war.

That is all that this bill does. What honest opposition can there be to it? The officers in the Marine Corps have now all these rights. Why make flesh of one set of officers and fowl of the other? Why discriminate against these brave and honorable men of the Revenue-Cutter Service? They ask for nothing in this bill that is not fair and just and right and proper.

There is not a member in this House who can arise in his place and say one derogatory word against the valor of these faithful men and the justice of their demands and claims as embodied in this bill.

There does not appear to be any valid reason why a body of officers who in every other respect serve upon a level with those of the Army and Navy should be denied equal compensation. The following table will show the wide difference which exists in this particular, while it also shows an unjustifiable discrimination against the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service:

Difference in pay of officers, rank for rank, in the Army, Navy, and Revenue-Cutter Service after twenty years of service.

Army.		Navy.		Revenue-Cutter Service.	
Rank.	Pay.	Rank.	Pay.	Rank.	Pay.
Majors.....	\$3,500	Lieutenant-commanders.....	\$3,500	Captains.....	\$2,500
Captains.....	2,530	Lieutenants.....	2,520	First lieutenants and chief engineers.....	1,800
First lieutenants.....	2,140	Lieutenants (junior).....	2,140	Second lieutenants and first assistant engineers.....	1,500
Second lieutenants.....	2,000	Ensigns.....	2,000	Third lieutenants and second assistant engineers.....	1,200

It is essential to the morale and efficiency of any service such as this that there should be some reward for length of service. In the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps this is given in the shape of an increase of compensation at the rate of 10 per cent for each five years of service up to twenty years, or 40 per cent. Why should these officers, who are upon the same level in all things else, in life tenure of office, in general duties in peace and war, be denied this consideration?

It must be obvious that an officer who has served a given number of years in a particular grade should be entitled to better compensation than another who has just been promoted to that grade. Under existing conditions an officer who has served twenty years in one grade gets exactly the same compensation as another who has just been promoted to that grade.

But to illustrate further: Suppose that there are 30 officers in a given grade; that the annual salary of each officer of that grade is \$1,800, that the first 10 of these have served fifteen years, the next 10 have served ten years, and the remaining 10 five years, then—

The first 10 would receive \$1,800 plus 30 per cent.....	\$2,340
The next 10 would receive \$1,800 plus 20 per cent.....	2,160
The remaining 10 would receive \$1,800 plus 10 per cent.....	1,980

But without the percentage of increase the man who has served fifteen years would receive no more than he who has served but five years.

Under date of March 31, 1884, the Hon. Charles J. Folger, then Secretary of the Treasury, in a letter addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, House of Representatives, when recommending the enactment of a bill covering the features of this one (S. 1025), used the following language on the subject of an increase of compensation for length of service:

A third provision, to wit, that providing increase of pay for length of service, commends itself to my judgment as just and advantageous in a public sense. It seems to me based upon correct business principles, it being generally recognized that experience gives value to labor in proportion to the intelligence of the laborer and the importance of the work performed. In a technical service this is peculiarly the case, every year adding to the skill, trustworthiness, and ability of the officers.

There should not be, and there can not be, to my mind, any reason why, if officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps are

thus provided for, the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service should not be. The latter perform every duty in peace and war that officers of the Navy do. The Revenue-Cutter Service is not a volunteer service, but is an organized regular service, just as much as the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, and is subject to the orders of the President just as they are.

The necessity for this legislation has been urged upon Congress by every Secretary of the Treasury from 1872 to 1901.

President McKinley, in his message to the Fifty-sixth Congress in December, 1900, used the following language:

Attention is invited to the recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury for legislation in behalf of the Revenue-Cutter Service, and favorable action is urged.

It should not be forgotten that the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service who will be retired under the age clause of this bill must serve until they reach the evening of life, or 64 years, while the naval officer must retire at 62, and that an officer may be retired in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps after thirty years of service. The Revenue-Cutter Service asks that when old age sets in, after a lifetime spent in service, or when they become incapacitated from disability contracted in the performance of duty, that they may retire from active work and peacefully end their days upon the same terms that are accorded to officers of the other technical services of this Government.

The fact must not be lost sight of that of the 37 captains now upon the active list of the Revenue-Cutter Service, 16 have served from thirty-two to forty years, while the remaining 21 have served thirty years, each as commanding officers, while there is not an officer in the Navy of the grade of lieutenant-commander who has served as a commissioned officer over thirty years.

Now, sir, in regard to the objection of some that this bill will tend to create a civil pension list, I wish to say that it will not create a civil pension list any more than the Navy or the Marine Corps has created a civil pension list. There is no difference. There is not and there can not be any valid distinction. The Revenue-Cutter Service is and always has been essentially military.

Its military character was officially stated by the Treasury Department in the report of the service in 1881, as follows:

The Revenue-Cutter Service, while charged by law with the performance of important civil duties, is essentially military in its character. Each vessel is provided with great guns and furnished with as full a complement of small arms for its crew as any ship of war. Its officers are required to be proficient in military drill and possess a thorough knowledge of the uses of both great and small arms. Its crews are required to be instructed from day to day at the great guns and in the use of small arms.

Commanding officers are required, while boarding vessels arriving in ports of the United States, in case of failure or refusal of any such vessel on being hailed to come to and submit to the proper inspection by an officer of the service, to fire first across her bows as a warning, and in case of persistent refusal to resort to shot or shell to compel obedience. In the performance of this work they are likely at any time to receive injuries and to be subjected to the same dangers in time of peace as the force employed on naval vessels.

By act of March 2, 1799, it is provided that the revenue cutters shall, whenever the President so directs, cooperate with the Navy. It will be observed that the cooperation of the two services prescribed in the act above quoted is not contingent upon a state of war or other particularly perilous conditions. On the contrary, it may take place in time of peace and for specific purposes and when less hazard is involved to the two services than pertains to the discharge of a revenue vessel of its ordinary duties.

But if in legal theory they are civil employees, are they so in fact? Are they less positively a part of the military force in time of war than the Army or Navy? It is true that revenue vessels are not to be ordered into action on purely military service, offensive or defensive, except the President so directs; but neither are the vessels of the Navy.

The status of the Revenue-Cutter Service is therefore that of a coast-guard navy, as the Navy proper is an ocean navy. The one polices the coast and the other the ocean.

There is no duty performed by naval vessels in time of peace that can not be and has not been performed by vessels of the Revenue-Cutter Service, while in time of war they have taken part with the sister service.

The seizure of smugglers and the prevention of illicit trade—the only duty of the service that has direct relation with the collection of customs—is precisely similar to the duty of naval officers in seizing vessels engaged in contraband trade in time of war. Other duties of the Revenue-Cutter Service—such as the enforcement of the neutrality laws, the suppression of piracy and of mutinies in merchant vessels—are now actually imposed on and performed by the Navy in common with the Cutter Service.

The Revenue-Cutter Service manages to keep busy year in and year out. Like the Army and the Navy it is on duty all the year round; but unlike them, it has no winter season when its duties are less than at other times. In fact, the winter is the chief season for the revenue cutters, for then its vessels must be on the lookout for wrecks more carefully than ever. The report of the

Secretary of the Treasury shows briefly the operations of the service during the year ending last June, as follows:

Distance covered (nautical miles).....	312,091
Lives saved (actually rescued).....	55
Vessels boarded.....	20,089
Vessels seized and reported for violations.....	309
Fines of vessels so reported.....	\$54,800
Vessels assisted.....	77
Value of vessels assisted with cargoes.....	\$4,923,095
Persons on board assisted.....	3,520
Persons in distress cared for.....	201

This indicates considerable activity during the year on the part of our oldest military branch of the Government. Splendid record for one year, but it has been the same to a greater or a lesser degree year in and year out for more than a century.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, as an American citizen I take a great pride in the Revenue-Cutter Service, and as a member of Congress I am glad to say I favor this bill because I believe it is just, because these brave fellows have earned this reward and this recognition, and because I know the service the men on the revenue cutters of the United States do. From the icy waters of Alaska to the coral strands of Florida these men are always on deck, always on duty, always earning their pay, always in the service of their country. These men in time of peace do a great work saving lives, enforcing the law, and looking after wrecks and derelicts on the high seas. Their work is never done.

The duties of revenue cutters in times of peace appeal to the public more forcibly than in times of war. At the present time a cordon of cutters is cruising along our Atlantic coast, not to suppress smuggling, as that has been almost entirely stamped out, but in the interest of humanity, to rescue the shipwrecked mariners, to lend aid to vessels in distress, and to destroy those menaces to life and property on the seas, the numerous derelicts, whose specter-like forms are almost daily encountered along the ocean highways.

These are the men who are asking us for relief—who are asking us to pass this bill—men who share equal danger with their more favored brothers in the Army and Navy in times of war, and who, in times of peace, having no sinecure to drop into on shore, are daily performing the most hazardous duties at sea in the interest of humanity. Will you not give to these brave officers the same consideration you give to the Army and the Navy? The Revenue-Cutter Service, coeval with the foundation of our Government, a part of all of our history in war and in peace, is now knocking at the door of the American Congress, asking for just treatment. In every war it has been true to the flag. The record it has made is the priceless heritage and the proud boast of every patriotic American. There is no day in the week, no month of the year, that these men in the Revenue-Cutter employ of the Government do not practically take their lives in their hands when they go to sea.

The Revenue-Cutter Service is not under the civil service, except for the fact that, as a matter of convenience, it is so classified in making the appropriation for its maintenance. No civil employee is compelled to fight for his country except he volunteers; yet every Revenue-Cutter officer is, simply by direction of the President, required to cooperate with the Navy in any duty whatsoever.

Never has a war been fought upon the seas by this country that the Revenue-Cutter Service has not taken an active part, whether it wanted to or not. Can this be said of any other branch of the civil service? When Congress, as a reward to volunteers on sea and land, voted two months' extra pay to each, did the Revenue-Cutter Service receive such extra compensation? The Auditor for the Navy and the Comptroller of the Treasury promptly decided that this service is a part of the regular establishment for the defense of the Government, and as such could in no way come under the classification of volunteers.

This bill passed the Senate without a dissenting vote. It ought to pass this House without division. It is as just a measure for as brave and as gallant a band of men as ever was submitted for consideration to a legislative body, and I hope, I believe, it will soon be a law. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BELLAMY] for fifteen minutes.

Mr. BELLAMY. Mr. Chairman, I can not expect to add much to the arguments that have already been presented in favor of this measure in the short time allotted to me, but I desire simply to reenforce what has been already said, and to give some additional reasons for the passage of the pending measure. This bill has very unjustly and improperly been stigmatized as a bill to create another civil pension list.

Mr. Chairman, as an original proposition, if a bill was proposed before this body to-day to retire the officers of the Army and Navy, I myself would not give it my sanction. In fact, in this country of ours, I do not as a general rule believe in having a retired list; but it has grown up in our system for the Army and

Navy, and in a part of the service—the Revenue-Cutter Department—which is just as effective and which, both in war and in peace, is the equal of the Navy in every respect, if not its superior in some, I think it is an injustice to the men in the Revenue-Marine Service to withhold from them the compensation and emoluments that are extended to the Navy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me say that I was much impressed by the arguments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MINOR] in support of this measure. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN] gave to this body the course of study that the cadets on a training ship of the Revenue-Marine Service, after being admitted to the service, had to pass, and compared it with that of the Navy, showing conclusively to my mind it was an equally efficient education and made men just as cultured, just as patriotic, just as competent to man the Navy of our Government as does the course at Annapolis. I do not believe that an education at West Point or Annapolis makes an aristocracy of its graduates.

Mr. Chairman, there must be in a man to make him a gentleman something more than a college can give him. There must be moral instincts which come not alone from training, but must be there by nature.

Here and there my lord is lower than his oxen and his swine;
Here and there a cotter's babe is royal born by right divine.

But, sir, let me say that if the members of this body will consult the manual of examinations of the classified civil service they will see there the requisites of admission to the training ship in the Revenue-Marine Service, and will also see the examination required of cadets who apply for admission to the Naval Academy. During the last year the officers in charge of the Naval Academy applied to the Civil Service Commission to have the examination of cadets take place in various parts of the country for the convenience of the applicants; and let me show you how much superior the requisites for admission to the Marine Service are to those for admission to Annapolis.

On the first day of the examination for admission to the Revenue-Cutter Service there are exercises in spelling, geography, history, the Constitution of the United States, and grammar. On the first day of the examination for admission to Annapolis they have punctuation, grammar, geography, history, world's history, reading, and spelling.

On the second day to be admitted to the Revenue-Cutter Service the examination comprises algebra, including quadratics and binomial theorem, geometry, plane and the elements of solid, and trigonometry, plane. What is prescribed for admission to the Naval Academy? Simple arithmetic and algebra.

On the third day for admission to the Naval Academy it is geometry, and in no instance are they examined upon simple trigonometry, or spherical trigonometry, or the higher branches of mathematics.

On the third day of the Revenue-Cutter Service examination they are examined on physics, chemistry, inorganic, and general information. These subjects are not examined on at all for admission to Annapolis. Now, I say, sir, there are very superior and higher requisites for admission to the Revenue-Marine Service over that for admission to Annapolis.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me submit another reason to my brethren here to-day. The remarks of the opponents of this measure have impressed me very much, that the gentlemen who have been antagonizing this bill are thoroughly unacquainted with the methods, practices, and requirements of the Revenue-Marine Service. I believe I am safe in venturing the assertion that there is not a man who has raised his voice against this bill upon this floor who has ever in his life been on the deck of a revenue cutter, not one.

It takes some familiarity with the sea, it takes some acquaintance with the cutter service and the naval service to compare them justly, and no man with equal knowledge of them both can fail to come to the conclusion that the service of the revenue marines is equally effective in time of war and more effective in time of peace than is the naval service of our Government. I do not deny the importance of the naval branch of our Government; they are chivalrous in peace and valorous in war, but not more so than the splendid set of officers who honor the Revenue-Cutter Service. I wish to send to the desk to have read the instructions that were given in November last to Captain Willey, commanding the U. S. S. *Algonquin*, at the port in which I reside. I desire to show by this what the duties of the Revenue-Cutter Service are from the 1st day of December to the 1st day of April, during the four months of winter. I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
DIVISION OF REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE,
Washington, November 26, 1901.

Capt. O. S. WILLEY, R. C. S.,
Commanding U. S. S. *Algonquin*, Wilmington, N. C.

SIR: The President having designated the revenue steamer *Algonquin* to cruise under the provisions of section 1536, Revised Statutes, to afford such

aid to distressed navigators as the circumstances may require and as may be in your power to render, you are directed to have your command in readiness to enter upon this important duty by the 1st proximo.

In order that you may be able to extend the necessary relief to the crews of such vessels in distress as you may discover or fall in with, the *Algonquin* should be provided with provisions, water, and fuel, in such quantities as can be stowed conveniently.

Having in all respects prepared your command for the work contemplated by these orders, you are directed to cruise your ship actively from the date named until April 1, 1902, from Wilmington north to Cape Hatteras and south to Charleston, S. C., making a harbor when stress of weather, want of fuel, provisions, or other good reasons may make it necessary, keeping at all times a vigilant lookout for vessels in need of assistance.

You will govern your movements so that as little time as possible shall be spent at Wilmington or at any other port upon the cruising grounds herein assigned you, the purpose being that constant and vigilant activity shall govern the movements of your command.

You are directed to confer with all chief officers of the customs at such ports as you may visit, with a view to obtaining information concerning infractions of law to enable you, as far as may be, to correct the same.

You will make it a point, whenever practicable, to keep within communication by telegraph, advising all collectors of customs at ports visited, before sailing on a cruise, of your next port, in order that they may communicate to you intelligence of disability or distress on the coast or other matters requiring your attention to enable you to proceed without loss of time to execute such duty as may be indicated to you.

Upon your arrival at any port or anchorage having mail communication, you will announce the fact by letter to the Department, giving date of arrival, date of probable departure, and destination, adding reasons for stay in port or anchorage of more than twenty-four hours' duration. As soon as possible after entering a port you will send an officer on shore for the purpose of getting information of vessels stranded or otherwise in distress, and upon gaining such intelligence, if the circumstances of the case require it, you will get under way at once and proceed to the scene, rendering such service as may be possible.

From the first port entered after having rendered assistance of any kind you will submit a report to the Department upon the usual form (No. 2015), giving such particulars as will show fully the services performed.

In all cases of assistance rendered you will elaborate all details, in order that a clear comprehension of the duty performed may be conveyed.

You are to understand that the successful accomplishment of the objects of the duty herein assigned will require constant and energetic direction, and no excuse short of disablement of your ship will be accepted for a lax or perfunctory performance of the winter work.

In carrying out the instructions contained in these orders you will not only attend to such duties as come under your observation in the course of cruising, but you are charged with the duty of seeking work for your command.

You are not restricted in any way, but, on the contrary, are given full latitude to respond in all cases where the duty of aiding distressed vessels, and in the performance of work, you may be useful. There must be no idleness of your command upon any pretense whatever. In short, you are expected to be active and energetic in looking for work for your command, and will not wait for it to "turn up."

You are further informed that you will be held responsible for the lack of strict compliance with the provisions of the Regulations of the Revenue-Cutter Service embodied in paragraphs 133-142, inclusive, and you will therefore carefully inform yourself of the purport of the regulations cited and govern yourself accordingly.

Should you gain information of the presence within your cruising limits of derelicts or strands in the path of commerce, you will not wait for orders in the premises, but will do all in your power to remove or destroy such, and immediately report your action to the Department.

If you find a derelict that can not be removed without "blowing it up," you will at once report the fact by wire to the Department for its action.

The interests of the public service, no less than those of the Revenue-Cutter Service, demand that, as a commander of a public vessel, you should give your time and best energies to the discharge of the onerous trusts imposed by law and regulations in the duty herein assigned to your command, and it is hoped that you will leave no effort untried to make for your command an enviable record of work done and duty performed.

Groping about the coast in fog and thick weather, making runs at night, or cruising in gales of wind (unless caught out), practices heretofore followed for the sole purpose of covering distances, will not be approved. In the cruising of your command you must have in view the performance of effective work only.

Your attention is called to the necessity of boarding and examining vessels fallen in with while under way or in harbor for the enforcement of the customs and navigation laws, and ample boarding lists will furnish one evidence of the energetic performance of duty.

You will inform the officers of your command that no leaves of absence will be granted by the Department from the beginning until the end of winter cruising.

Respectfully,

H. A. TAYLOR, Assistant Secretary.

Mr. MANN. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. BELLAMY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. May I inquire of the gentleman if this is a copy of printed instructions, or was this a letter of instructions to this particular captain?

Mr. BELLAMY. These are instructions to that particular captain, but they are similar to those sent to every other captain on the coast whose vessel is engaged in work similar to the *Algonquin*.

Mr. MANN. May I inquire what was the necessity of giving the particular instructions of this character in reference to regulations of law to a captain who has been in the service for a great many years?

Mr. BELLAMY. The reason is that during eight months of the year these gentlemen in the Revenue-Cutter Service are not required to cruise along the coast so constantly, but during the months of December, January, February, and March, when gales prevail, when we have much loss of life and property, during the freezing weather, when there is rain, sleet, and snow, and when there is generally great peril to life and property at sea, it is made incumbent upon the chief officer of this service to divide the coast into districts, and direct the cutters to watch certain portions of the coast. The *Algonquin* is given as her sphere of

duty the seaboard from Hatteras to Charleston, another steamer from Charleston down, another steamer from Hatteras up to Delaware Bay, and so on up to the coast of Maine.

Mr. MANN. What I wished to get at was whether this instruction was something new to captains, or whether during Captain Willey's thirty years of service he had ever acted in the same capacity before.

Mr. BELLAMY. Oh, yes; they are annual instructions, but are given at the beginning of every winter season; and I have simply had these instructions read as a part of their duties to show you the nature and character of the service of these men. During the four months I have designated—December, January, February, and March—when it is sleeting and raining and freezing, these people are not even permitted to go into port, except when necessary to make a report or to supply the ship with exhausted provisions or coal. Yet in the meantime, during the corresponding period, where are the officers of the Navy, as a rule, may I ask? They are at Hampton Roads, or at other ports of the country, lying on their easy couches, or socially chatting, smoking fine cigars, and probably some on shore dancing the german or the cotillions.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman submit to another interruption?

Mr. BELLAMY. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. This same steamer, the *Algonquin*, was at Wilmington last winter a year ago as well as this last winter, was it not?

Mr. BELLAMY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. I suppose engaged in the performance of the same duties.

Mr. BELLAMY. Only after it is ordered by the Secretary to proceed.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman able to inform us whether during the winter of 1890 and 1891 this steamer that you have mentioned, the *Algonquin*, was engaged in cruising up the coast, as the gentleman says, "during the sleet and rain," and not permitted to go into port?

Mr. BELLAMY. This is a general regulation that is issued each year, as I understand it, and the *Algonquin* was likewise engaged in the season before, and each antecedent season since her construction.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman permit me—

Mr. BELLAMY. You are consuming my time.

Again, Mr. Chairman, let me show another fallacy in the arguments of the opponents of this bill. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON] consumed two columns of the RECORD of yesterday to show that this bill, if it becomes a law, will give the Revenue-Cutter officers greater compensation than the officers of a similar rank in the Navy now get. He based his whole argument upon section 1556 of the Revised Statutes, and quotes it, or a part of it, in the RECORD.

The gentleman from Alabama attempted to show that a captain of the Revenue-Cutter Service would get more pay than a lieutenant-commander of the Navy, with whom, under this bill, he would hold equal rank. The gentleman, unintentionally of course, quoted that section of the Revised Statutes for the amount of pay the naval officer now receives. This statute, as he should know, was repealed by the personnel bill, approved March 3, 1899, so that it has no existence now whatever. Lieutenant-commanders now, according to law, receive the same pay as a major in the Army and the same pay which it is proposed to give captains of the Revenue-Cutter Service; the pay is \$2,500 a year. A lieutenant-commander in the Navy or a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service will, by force of circumstances, both have served at least twenty years before reaching either grade. This will entitle them to four increases of 10 per cent each, so that they will both actually receive the same salary—that is, \$3,500 per year.

It must be borne in mind that the rank of lieutenant-commander in the Navy is only an intermediate step in promotion, as anyone in that grade is eligible for promotion to a commander, then to captain, and, finally, to the grade of rear-admiral, when he would receive as high as \$7,500 a year.

On the other hand, when a Revenue-Cutter officer reaches the grade of captain that is as high as he can ever go. His salary can never be higher than \$3,500 a year, or less than one-half the amount the naval officer can reach.

Revenue-Cutter officers very seldom reach the highest grade before they are 52 years old, and some not until they are 60.

Navy officers, on the average, reach the grade of lieutenant-commander and begin to draw \$3,500 a year when they are between 40 and 45 years old.

The gentleman from Alabama also says the cutter officers are civil officers. They are not civil officers; they are the coast guard of our nation. In England her navy are assigned to this duty, and they are no more civil officers than are Britain's navy when performing these functions. They are in their very nature essen-

tially both naval and military. The revenue cutters of our country have participated in every war our country has waged. They were prominent and efficient in the war of 1812, the Seminole war, the Mexican war, the unfortunate civil war, and also in the Spanish war.

The men of this service are commissioned and dismissed the same as they are in the Navy. The seamen are enlisted, uniformed, and drilled as in the Navy. The ships are armed as similar ships in the Navy, and in the Spanish war they carried 61 large guns. They have ever cooperated with the Navy in peace as in war. They were prominent in the Bering Sea patrol, and were likewise prominent in preventing filibustering expeditions from being fitted out and sailing from our coast before the war with Spain. Their officers are invited and detailed to lecture before the Naval War College at Newport, and are eagerly sought to become associate members of the Naval Institute at Annapolis. Then why should they be dubbed civilians? To set this matter at rest, I can but quote from some very excellent remarks made by Mr. Scudder, of New York, at the last session of Congress, wherein is shown a potent decision of the Department on this subject:

It seems to have escaped general notice that the officers and men of the regular Revenue-Cutter Service can not volunteer, and therefore they are not volunteers. Second Lieut. Walker W. Joynes, Revenue-Cutter Service, has demonstrated this beyond a question of a doubt, having, in order to make a test case, applied for the two months' extra pay given to volunteers, he having served on the cutter *McCulloch* at the battle of Manila. His application was denied, and the Auditor for the Treasury Department and the Solicitor of the Treasury decided that—

"A regular officer or a regularly enlisted man of the regular Revenue-Cutter Service is not competent to volunteer in time of war, because it is just as much a part of his duty to serve as it is the duty of a regular officer or regularly enlisted man of the Army or Navy to serve in time of war."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BELLAMY. I am willing to answer any question of the gentleman, because I am of the belief that he is one who was never on the deck of a revenue cutter and knows nothing whatever of the true character of the Cutter Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SULZER. I hope the gentleman from New York will give the gentleman from North Carolina some more time.

Mr. SHERMAN. I can not yield any more time, as the time is all parceled out, so that I can not yield any gentleman any more.

Mr. BELLAMY. I wish the gentleman would yield me five minutes, so that I may complete one other argument I desire to make.

Mr. SHERMAN. I can not. I have made promises so that I can not yield any more time at present, and I am very sorry.

Mr. BELLAMY. Then I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD].

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, it seems almost a waste of time for a person to attempt to discuss a measure when there are probably not two men on the floor of the House who have not thoroughly made up their minds as to how they are going to vote on this question. But since I have been a member of this House, on all occasions when measures have been before this body looking either to a civil-pension list or putting gentlemen on the retired list, I have announced my views; and only for that purpose do I rise now.

The gentleman from North Carolina took occasion to criticize those who opposed this bill as being wholly unfamiliar with the Revenue-Cutter Service. I supposed he referred to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN], and such other gentlemen as advocate this measure as gentlemen who have seen many years of hard and arduous service on the plains of their resident country. The gentleman before he took his seat said that he had never been on the deck of a revenue cutter—

Mr. BELLAMY. Oh, no. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. LOUD. Certainly.

Mr. BELLAMY. I did not say that I had never been on the deck of a revenue cutter. I said that of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. LOUD. Well, then, I misunderstood the gentleman. But, however that may be, Mr. Chairman, I will venture to assert that there are as many barnacles on the backs of the gentlemen who oppose this measure as there are on those who advocate it. I am opposed to this measure, and should have opposed the retirement provision for the Army and should have opposed the retirement provision for the Navy if I had been a member of this body at the time such legislation was up. A pension provision or a retirement provision for those who work for the United States Government is absolutely wrong in principle. If a retirement law have any equity whatever, then that law must first be made

to apply to those who are poor and unfortunate in their old age. A man who perchance through influence has been upon the Government pay roll all of his life at a higher salary than he could ever obtain anywhere else should have no more privileges, and is entitled to no more privileges than the men who have never received these large salaries.

I am opposed to a retirement or a civil pension list on principle. But if it be equitable then the same system of retirement should be inaugurated in this country that is inaugurated in New Zealand—that is, when a man becomes old, when he is worn out, and has accumulated nothing during his life, the Government shall take care of him until he goes into his grave. But the difficulty with a civil pension list and a retirement list of any kind is that it is socialism run mad. If you provide a pension for a man when he shall have reached a certain age and retire him on three-fourths or half pay, you hold out to him the temptation to spend every dollar that he may earn; you hold out hope to him that there is a Government, of which he is a part, that will support him just so long as he may live. That stifles human incentive, hence is socialism.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that a man should be taught to look out for himself. A large majority of the men of this country do not make \$600 a year. They struggle and toil. They are subjected to the blasts of winter and the heat of summer; they bring up a large family; yet as every day goes by these provident men lay up a small amount of money, and by that very effort they are compelled to depend upon themselves. Take that away and you have a man useless to civilization.

I know a little something about the Revenue-Cutter Service, perhaps as much as the gentleman from North Carolina. My younger days were spent upon the sea; I spent more than a year, off and on, upon a revenue cutter. I have some familiarity in a general way with the Revenue-Cutter Service, and I know that a Revenue-Cutter officer is simply a civil employee of the Government. The gentleman says these officers may be called into active service in defense of their country. That is true. So is every male citizen between the ages of 18 and 45 liable to be called into the active service of his country.

Mr. BELLAMY. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. LOUD. Yes, sir.

Mr. BELLAMY. Is the gentleman familiar with the fact that after the Spanish war a certain Revenue-Cutter officer, in order to make a test case, applied for extra pay for his services during the war with Spain on a revenue cutter; and that the decision upon that case was that the Revenue-Cutter Service is a part of the military and naval department of the Government, and therefore the officers of that service are not entitled to any pay under such circumstances?

Mr. LOUD. Well, I do not care to argue that question. I will withdraw the statement, if it will please the gentleman, as my time is very limited. I have not had the time to investigate this subject thoroughly enough to make a technical speech upon it.

Mr. BELLAMY again rose.

Mr. LOUD. The point raised by the gentleman is wholly immaterial, and as I have only twenty minutes I do not care to argue the legal status of this case. I am willing to admit, if it will satisfy the gentleman, that these officers are in the military service. That question is really immaterial for the purposes of the argument that I have in view.

The gentleman says there are but 215 of these officers. Now, if it is just to retire the officer, who becomes a lieutenant in two years, why should we not retire the men? To this point a gentleman replied the other day that the men remain in the service only three years. I will venture to say that if you pay the men of the Revenue-Cutter Service a sufficient amount of money they will stay there until they die; and I am sure that the man on deck is entitled to the charity, or liberality at least, of his Government as much as the officer.

A young man enters the service as a cadet, and in two years becomes a lieutenant. I believe I am correct about that. Another young man enters the merchant service, and if he becomes a second officer in ten years, he is one out of five thousand, and when he gets to be second mate of a ship of 1,000 or 1,500 tons, how much salary would he get after possibly ten or fifteen years' service before the mast? As second mate of a ship of 1,000 or 1,500 tons he would get \$40 or \$50 a month when he could catch a job.

The motive power behind this bill is the motive that ultimately will force a civil pension list upon this Government. We have in effect a civil pension in every department already. Why, sir, there are men in those departments who have become incapacitated for performing service; and the head of the division, seeming to suppose that he is running the division and paying the salaries out of his own pocket, says: "I have not the heart to perform my duty to the people of this country; that is, I have a man here that can not earn a dollar a year. I will not dismiss him." Why, sir, under such circumstances the head of a bureau

or division has no discretion. He is put in his place simply to execute his duty to this Government, and he must see that every man performs his duty faithfully and well, and he has no discretion to keep an incompetent employee there drawing a salary and doing nothing.

Now, there are a number of officers in this Revenue-Cutter Service, I understand, who have been on waiting orders for a number of years. Why? Because the Secretary of the Treasury, in the goodness of his heart, has not the "mean" disposition, is not "cruel" enough, to dismiss them. He is perfectly willing that the man who is supporting his family on \$600 a year shall be taxed to keep this other man in idleness, but he has not the courage to perform his duty and dismiss that man from the service.

I am surrounded with these revenue officers, as I am surrounded by post-office clerks, letter carriers, and other Government officials. Probably I have as many of these people surrounding me as any other man here. San Francisco is the great commercial city of the Pacific coast. Revenue officers abound there.

They have been after me, as they have been after you, a number of years. They are connected by marriage or blood with some of my constituents, just as the officers of the Navy are connected by ties of marriage or blood with many of our constituents. As a result, we passed the naval personnel bill; and as a result, in order to get these old fellows out of the way who can not go to sea and perform duty—in order that they may be retired, and thus promotion be given to a lot of young men who are waiting—I suppose we shall pass this legislation. However, I hope not.

I say again—and I will not discuss this question from a legal standpoint—this is a civil service. An officer or man in the Revenue-Cutter Service is in the civil service of the Government. I venture the assertion that there were more men killed and wounded in the Railway Mail Service during the years 1900 and 1901 than have ever been killed in the Revenue-Cutter Service since more than one hundred years ago. Why not pension them? Why not retire them? It is a more dangerous service than the Revenue-Cutter Service. Then take the men who are in the Life-Saving Service, a service a thousand times more dangerous than the Revenue-Cutter Service. Why not pension them?

But gentlemen say, "These men sometimes perform naval duty." Well, perhaps they do. But after you shall have provided for the retirement of Revenue-Cutter officers—officers in the civil service of the Government—you have approached so near to the retirement of any and every civil Government employee that you can not longer rise in your place and oppose the retirement of other men in the civil service.

And that is where the danger is, and I want to point out to the House, and the only object I sought to obtain was for a moment to call attention to the danger of passing legislation of this kind, because after you once embark you are on the broad sea of retirement or civil pensions for all time to come; and if you are going to embark in civil pensions, then I say those most entitled are not those in the Government service, but those outside of the Government service who receive a much less salary than the average man who works for the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, how much time has the gentleman from California consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. Sixteen minutes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MAHON having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4872. An act to amend an act entitled "An act governing the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents," approved January 12, 1895.

Senate concurrent resolution 33.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed and bound in cloth 6,000 copies of the revised course of study for Indian schools; 1,500 for the use of the House of Representatives and 1,500 for the use of the superintendent of Indian schools.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 11053. An act providing for issuance of patent to the town site of Basin City, Wyo., to the municipal authorities thereof for the use and benefit of said town, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12095. An act to amend section 4883 of the Revised Statutes relating to the signing of letters patent for inventions;

H. R. 283. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert M. McCullough;

H. R. 610. An act to correct the military record of John F. Antlitz;

H. R. 725. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Arbaugh;

H. R. 809. An act granting an increase of pension to James P. Burchfield;
 H. R. 918. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Misner;
 H. R. 1190. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert S. Whittier;
 H. R. 1275. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Thomas;
 H. R. 1278. An act granting an increase of pension to La Myra V. Kendig;
 H. R. 1503. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Farrell;
 H. R. 1714. An act granting an increase of pension to Levi H. Winslow;
 H. R. 1938. An act granting an increase of pension to Helen V. Rorer;
 H. R. 2287. An act granting an increase of pension to George McDaniel;
 H. R. 2545. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac H. Crim;
 H. R. 2770. An act granting an increase of pension to Otilia M. Smoot;
 H. R. 3275. An act granting an increase of pension to William G. Johnson;
 H. R. 5327. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Mackey;
 H. R. 5712. An act granting a pension to Alice Bozeman;
 H. R. 5761. An act granting a pension to Thomas F. Walter;
 H. R. 6016. An act granting an increase of pension to William J. Overman;
 H. R. 6196. An act transferring a lot in Woodland Cemetery to city of Quincy, Ill.;
 H. R. 6438. An act granting an increase of pension to Matthew C. Medbury;
 H. R. 6687. An act granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo Blackman;
 H. R. 6918. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Bliss;
 H. R. 7250. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret Hendry;
 H. R. 7811. An act granting a pension to Mary King;
 H. R. 8048. An act granting an increase of pension to James A. Bramble;
 H. R. 8471. An act granting a pension to Eliza A. Wright;
 H. R. 8651. An act granting a pension to Maggie Helmbold;
 H. R. 8696. An act granting an increase of pension to William B. Rowe;
 H. R. 9621. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew Y. Transue;
 H. R. 9791. An act granting an increase of pension to John Reep;
 H. R. 9848. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Cowgill;
 H. R. 10141. An act granting an increase of pension to William R. Armstrong;
 H. R. 10415. An act granting a pension to Sarah M. Smith; and
 H. R. 10692. An act granting an increase of pension to David C. Maples.

REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] for twenty minutes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, the Revenue-Cutter Service is a necessary and an honorable branch of the public service and I have no doubt it performs its functions most creditably. I have no disposition to disparage the efficiency or the merits of this branch of the service. As a matter of fact I know personally but little about it in detail. When a bill similar to this was up for consideration last year I made a few remarks in opposition to the measure, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] followed me and said that, judging from the character of the speech I made, he inferred that I believed a revenue cutter to be very similar to the cutter that Santa Claus drives over the country with his reindeers in distributing benefactions to the good little boys and girls at yuletide. Gentlemen have asserted repeatedly, in discussion of this bill, that it is a meritorious measure; that no just grounds have been advanced why it should be defeated.

The burden, Mr. Chairman, is upon the advocates of the measure. I have listened patiently to most of the discussion, and it seems to me that no adequate reasons have been advanced by a single advocate of the measure why it should become a law. The bill, I admit, is somewhat of an improvement over the one reported a year ago, but the vicious principle is still retained. The question of the character of the Revenue-Cutter Service, whether civil or military, is hardly open to discussion. It is not a debatable question. The Revenue-Cutter Service is ancient and honor-

able—it was organized in 1790, for the purpose of assisting in the collection of the customs. It is under the control of the Secretary of the Treasury. The revenue cutters of course carry an armament; that is necessary. It is just as necessary for revenue cutters to be armed for the enforcement of the law as it is for police officers in the municipalities to carry guns and clubs; just as necessary as it is for deputy marshals in the moonshine districts of the country to go armed.

Its military character is only incidental. Its military functions are altogether subordinate. When you come to consider the question of justice to this branch of the public service, let me ask, gentlemen, by what standard they undertake to measure that intangible essence. There are two sides to the question, and in dealing with it we not only owe a duty to the men engaged in the service, but at the same time we must keep in mind the interests of the people of the country. There is only one principle by which we can determine the question of justice in the public service. When any branch of the public service offers sufficient inducements to attract men away from the activities of individual life—to attract a sufficient number of competent men—and they are paid their fixed salaries, full justice has been done to all.

It is not denied that men in this service are paid better, more munificently, than men in the civil operations of life are paid for similar kinds of service, but gentlemen say they are not as well paid as the Army and Navy. That may be. I know they are not as a matter of fact. But we are told that they are not relatively as well paid as the Army and Navy, and that the Revenue-Cutter Service is substantially upon the same basis as the others. Why, gentlemen in their enthusiasm in support of this bill have placed the Revenue-Cutter Service upon a pedestal and glorified it here. We know, Mr. Chairman, that it is simply the great ocean patrol, that it is a coast guard of the United States, and I believe it bears about the same relation to the United States Navy that the great forces of municipal police bear to the Army. In the great cities of this country, so well and efficiently policed, the salaries are lower than the salaries paid to the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service to-day, and in few of them is there leave of absence or sick leave. Some of the States have established not a retired list, but a police pension list. That may be very proper, but it is a local matter altogether. The only purpose of this bill is to increase the rank and the pay of the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service. It is entitled "A bill to promote the efficiency of the service." How does it promote the efficiency of the service? Has any gentleman, any advocate of the measure, explained in what particular a single provision of the bill has promoted or is calculated to promote the efficiency of the service?

Mr. GRAHAM. If the gentleman will allow me, I call attention to the fact that this bill provides for the removal of some of the barnacles that have been overhead in this service, that are filling the higher positions, that will be retired under this act, if it passes.

Mr. MAHON. Some of them 88 years old.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will not that improve the efficiency of the service? I have in mind one man in particular who is over 90 years of age, who is in this service, who is not doing a particle of work, and yet he and others like him are depriving younger men of promotion and of positions.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, it is a sad commentary upon the public service and upon the character of its organization if it has no method of disposing of incapacitated public officers. I do not believe the public service is any such condition as that. The Government is not called upon to retain on the pay roll at high salaries men who are unable to earn a single dollar.

Mr. GRAHAM. This service has such men.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Then the fault is in the administration and not in the law. It ought to be more wisely administered.

I understand that under this bill the barnacles to whom the gentleman refers are to be put upon the retired list with probably \$125 a year more pay than the most efficient men of the same grade in the active list are getting to-day. They are to be put upon the retired list at about five times as much as the great army of toilers and home builders to whom the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] referred, five times as much as they get for active service, that great army who have no sick leave, no annual leave, and no retirement list.

Mr. GRAHAM. Does the gentleman consider \$2,500 a year an outrageous sum to pay an efficient officer who has given his life to the service?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I consider \$2,500 a year too much to pay to any man for doing nothing. I am willing to pay \$2,500 or \$25,000 for an adequate return.

Mr. GRAHAM. Then why did you vote for the retirement provision for the Army and Navy?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. My recollection is that I was not in public life when that grave and important question was up for consideration.

Mr. GRAHAM. How would the gentleman have voted in that case?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is a different proposition. I do not know.

Mr. GRAHAM. The last Army bill was March 3, 1899. It contained that provision. Did the gentleman vote for it?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not remember.

Mr. LANDIS. I should like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania how he would vote on a proposition to retire the railway mail clerks?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is not a parallel case, because that is purely civil service and this is not.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. A great deal stronger case can be made in favor of the railway mail clerks.

Mr. LANDIS. Certainly it can. The case of the railway mail clerks is a great deal stronger.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a branch of the civil service and this is not.

Mr. SHAFROTH. May I ask the gentleman how he would vote on a similar proposition for the officers of the transport service?

Mr. MANN. I should like to ask the gentleman how he would vote on a proposition for a retired list for the Life-Saving Service?

Mr. GRAHAM. I believe that would be quite proper, and if such a proposition comes up I will vote for it.

Mr. MANN. And the Light-House Service?

Mr. GRAHAM. No; not the Light-House Service. That is different.

Mr. MANN. And the deputy-marshal service?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no similarity whatever between the cases.

Mr. MANN. That is the most dangerous service under the Government.

Mr. LANDIS. The Internal-Revenue Service.

Mr. MANN. Yes; it is the most dangerous service under the Government.

Mr. LESSLER. How about Congressmen?

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman from Illinois certainly does not mean to say that we are living in a country where, with very few exceptions, in possibly half a dozen districts in the United States, a deputy marshal is in danger in the discharge of his duty under the laws of the country?

Mr. MANN. There are more deputy marshals killed in two years than there are killed in the Revenue-Cutter Service in a hundred years.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think there is no doubt about it. Here is the deputy-marshal service, the municipal police, the municipal fire-department service; here is the Life-Saving Service and the Railway Mail Service, where the percentage of casualties is much greater according to the records than in the Revenue-Cutter Service.

Mr. GROSVENOR. And the same may be said of the Army and the Navy, both.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is true. But in this country there is a great deal of sentiment and patriotism about the Army and Navy. They are supposed to be the embodiment of the power and the chivalry of the country, and they have a certain social standing to maintain, whatever may be thought of that aspect of the question.

Mr. GROSVENOR. And we have just astonished the world with our Navy, and astonished all mankind, and lost but one man in doing it.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is much to the credit of the Navy, I think.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The imbecility of the enemy.

Mr. ROBERTS. I will ask the gentleman, if he believes that the Army and the Navy should have retirement and pensions on the ground of patriotism and chivalry, how can he refuse it to the men in the Revenue-Cutter Service, when the first gun in the civil war and the first gun at Manila were fired from revenue cutters?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not know that that is at all significant in determining this question. As much and as splendid fighting was done on the part of the State militia during the civil war as was done on the part of any organization of equal force in the Army.

Mr. ROBERTS. They are getting their pensions.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. They are getting their pensions, and I will add that under the law officers and petty officers and seamen included in the Revenue Service get the same pensions that are given to the naval service where disability occurs in the performance of duty in time of war.

Now, I said a moment ago that this bill is entitled "A bill to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service." Let me ask a single man upon the floor in what respect it promotes the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service except to dispose of a

few "barnacles," as they were designated by my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM]. If longevity pay is necessary to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service, it is likewise necessary to promote the efficiency of the public service in all branches of the Administration. If it is necessary, and the argument is that it is necessary, to promote the efficiency, then it should be applied to promote the efficiency of the service in all the departments at Washington. What is there in the argument? Nothing at all. It is said that there ought to be some inducement to better service. Is not the hope of promotion inducement enough? I assume that with all the Revenue-Cutter officers the hope of promotion induces them to grow in efficiency.

Now, when a young man is appointed as a cadet in the Revenue-Cutter Service, and is commissioned after two years, he gets \$900 a year during his cadetship. Then he gets his commission, and at least \$1,200 a year, and he is quickly promoted. I think promotions come more quickly in the Revenue-Cutter Service than in the Army or Navy. The ways of life are open to the young man. A great many young men in the country—more than is required by the needs of this service—are willing to avoid the conflicts of civil life and forego its opportunities for achievement in order that they may provide a sure and comfortable support for themselves and families during life. When a man gets a commission in the Revenue-Cutter Service he is beyond want. His needs are provided for. His pay may not be as great as in some lines of service, but he gets a certainty. He gladly yields the broader opportunities and better privileges that civil life offers, with its chances of failure, for the certainty in this service. Does anybody claim that this service is not able to get all the efficient men that it requires under present conditions?

When was there a time in this country, except possibly under abnormal conditions, when there was not an abundance of cadets and an abundance of men in the country who were willing to go into the service and accept commissions and to perform all the arduous labors that gentlemen say belong to it. The pay that these men get is twice the pay that is given people for similar service in private life. When the bill is analyzed and looked into from all standpoints it does not possess sufficient merit to entitle it to a place in the permanent statutes of the country. There is some reason, I confess, in the argument of inequality; but I am not ready to admit that the Revenue-Cutter Service in dignity and responsibility occupies anything like the position that the Navy of the United States does. In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, this is an attempt to establish an independent naval establishment.

Mr. Long, the Secretary of the Navy, two years ago addressed a letter upon a similar bill to Senator HALE, in which he condemned the measure because he said it practically established an independent naval establishment, with its corps of officers and with its board of examination and all that sort of thing. He said the question is, Do we need any additional naval establishment; and if so, how many? The Army transport service of the United States is independent of the Navy to-day, operating a considerable line of ships officered by men who hold the commissions of the United States Army. The argument of Mr. Long against the passage of that bill is cogent, and applies with equal force to this. Let the Revenue-Cutter Service continue to be a branch of the civil service; let it continue to be under the control of the Secretary of the Treasury, to assist in enforcing the customs laws, to prevent the smuggling of goods into this country, and to continue to patrol the coast.

Occupying this subordinate position, it may continue to be liable to be detailed into the military service in time of war, and when called into that service its character is military. As a rule, its vessels are small. They do not engage in actual fighting. They perform the messenger service of the Navy during the war. The Revenue-Cutter boats are principally dispatch boats. Of course, in the execution of their work they must occasionally come into positions of danger; they must fight, and they do. Revenue cutters are officered and manned by American citizens, with American versatility and power to meet any emergency, to do anything that may confront them. Nevertheless this is a branch of the civil service.

To pass a measure of this kind is a dangerous step in the wrong direction. The fact that such a measure is proposed is one of the best illustrations I have seen of the grasping tendency of all branches of the public service to get more power, more pay, and more rank. I would like to know, in the name of justice and of the people, where this movement is going to stop. When this bill shall become a law, if it does pass, and when the Life-Saving Service comes knocking at the door of Congress, asking for more pay, asking for a retired list, asking for rank and position, how can we deny it? I think as much of the Life-Saving Service as of any other branch of the public service, and I consider it the poorest paid, in consideration of the hazards of the service, of any branch of the public service. The Light-House Service, with its boats

that may be detailed for public service in time of war, has performed efficient service in connection with the Navy. That branch of the service may next come asking Congress to organize it upon the same basis, upon the same plane, as the Revenue-Marine Service. And what answer will the gentlemen make to that request? How will they respond to a demand for the equality of that service with the Revenue-Marine?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service provides in section 1 the grades in the service.

Section 2 provides for the rank of officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service with corresponding grades in the Army and Navy.

Section 3 provides for the compensation of the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service, placing them on exactly the same level with officers of the Army and Navy, including the percentage of increase for length of service up to twenty years, or what is familiarly known as "longevity pay."

The remaining section provides for the retirement from active service of commissioned officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service who have or may become physically, mentally, or morally disqualified.

The following table will show the wide difference which exists in pay, while it also shows an unjustifiable discrimination against the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service:

Difference in pay of officers, rank for rank, in the Army, Navy, and Revenue Cutter Service after twenty years of service.

Army.		Navy.		Revenue-Cutter Service.	
Rank.	Pay.	Rank.	Pay.	Rank.	Pay.
Majors.....	\$3,500	Lieutenant-commanders.	\$3,500	Captains.....	\$2,500
Captains.....	2,520	Lieutenants...	2,520	First lieutenants and chief engineers.	1,800
First lieutenants.	2,140	Lieutenants (junior).	2,140	Second lieutenants and first assistant engineers.	1,500
Second lieutenants.	2,000	Ensigns.....	2,000	Third lieutenants and second assistant engineers.	1,200

It is essential to the morale and efficiency of any service such as this that there should be some reward for length of service. In the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps this is given in the shape of an increase of compensation at the rate of 10 per cent for each five years of service up to twenty years, or 40 per cent. Why should not these officers, who are upon the same level in all things else, in life tenure of office, in general duties in peace and war times, etc., be denied this consideration?

There does not appear to be any valid reason why a body of officers who in every other respect serve upon a level with those of the Army and Navy should be denied equal compensation.

The Revenue-Cutter Service was organized in 1790, eight years prior to the organization of the Navy. It took an active part in the war of 1812, in the Mexican war, in the civil war, and in the war with Spain.

The service now consists of about 200 officers and 1,000 men with about 40 vessels armed with 70 guns. The vessels in the service have increased from sailing vessels of 100 tons to steamships of 1,000 tons burden. The duties of the service in time of peace consist in the enforcement of all laws of the United States affecting the maritime interest of the nation; the arrest and prevention of illicit traffic by sea; the navigation laws, compelling all kinds of craft navigating the waters of the United States to comply with legal requirements in regard to documents, lights, steamboat inspection, and passenger laws; the quarantine laws; the rescue and succor of distressed vessels and crews; the drill and discipline of the life-saving crews; the supervision of construction of life-saving stations, and the entire inspection work of that service, the supervision of anchorage grounds established by law, etc.

The duty performed in this service when rescuing crews of distressed vessels has been most important. It has been the saving of innumerable lives and of vast values in property. In the minority report upon this bill attention is called to the fact that these reports are not submitted in detail to Congress. They are submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury, and are on file in the Bureau subject to the inspection at any time of anybody who desires to see them.

Now, sir, in regard to the objection of some that this bill will tend to create a civil pension list, I wish to say that it will not create a civil pension list any more than the Navy or the Marine Corps has created a civil pension list.

Mr. Chairman, the military character of this was service offi-

cially stated by the Treasury Department in the report of the service in 1881, as follows:

The Revenue-Cutter Service, while charged by law with the performance of important civil duties, is essentially military in its character. Each vessel is provided with great guns and furnished with as full a complement of small arms for its crew as any ship of war. Its officers are required to be proficient in military drill and possess a thorough knowledge of the uses of both great and small arms. Its crews are required to be instructed from day to day at the great guns and in the use of small arms.

Commanding officers are required, while boarding vessels arriving in ports of the United States, in case of failure or refusal of any such vessel on being hailed to come to and submit to the proper inspection by an officer of the service, to fire first across her bows as a warning, and in case of persistent refusal to resort to shot or shell to compel obedience. In the performance of this work they are likely at any time to receive injuries and to be subjected to the same dangers in time of peace as the force employed on naval vessels.

By act of March 2, 1799, it is provided that the revenue cutters shall, whenever the President so directs, cooperate with the Navy.

The men of this service are commissioned and dismissed the same as they are in the Navy. The seamen are enlisted, uniformed, and drilled as in the Navy. The ships are armed as similar ships in the Navy, and in the Spanish war they carried 61 large guns. They are not civilians. The following quotation from the speech of Mr. Scudder, of New York, in the Fifty-sixth Congress, bears directly on this question, as follows:

It seems to have escaped general notice that the officers and men of the regular Revenue-Cutter Service can not volunteer, and therefore they are not volunteers. Second Lieut. Walker W. Joynes, Revenue-Cutter Service, has demonstrated this beyond a question of a doubt, having, in order to make a test case, applied for the two months' extra pay given to volunteers, he having served on the cutter *McCulloch* at the battle of Manila. His application was denied, and the Auditor for the Treasury Department and the Solicitor of the Treasury decided that—

"A regular officer or a regularly enlisted man of the regular Revenue-Cutter Service is not competent to volunteer in time of war, because it is just as much a part of his duty to serve as it is the duty of a regular officer or regularly enlisted man of the Army or Navy to serve in time of war."

Candidates for appointment as cadets must pass a very rigid examination and take a two years' training on board of the training ship *Chase*. They are instructed in seamanship, navigation, ordnance and gunnery, international law, and many other necessary subjects. This, Mr. Chairman, shows that the requirements and duties place this service upon the same plane as the Navy, and the pay and prospects should be the same. The passage of this bill, that has passed the Senate, will give to the men in this service the relief to which they are entitled.

Mr. Chairman, another matter that I wish to refer to at this time is in relation to the erection of a monument to the memory of Brig. Gen. Count Casimir Pulaski, as provided for in House bill 16, introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRICK].

Congress has caused to be erected in this city monuments to many of the heroes of the war of the Revolution, but up to the present time it has neglected to perpetuate the memory of Brig. Gen. Count Casimir Pulaski in like manner—a champion of liberty whose high-minded patriotism and distinguished services should be immortalized by the erection of such a memorial. The passage of this bill will also redeem the resolution of the Continental Congress, which body on November 29, 1779, upon receiving information of the death of General Pulaski, passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That a monument be erected to the memory of Brigadier-General Count Pulaski, and that a committee of three be appointed to bring in a resolution for that purpose.

The members chosen were Mr. Gerry, Mr. Livingston, and Mr. Harnett.

Count Casimir Pulaski was born in Poland in the year 1747 and enlisted at the age of 21 years, under the leadership of his father, to fight for the continuance of independence of Poland, but history tells us that they were unsuccessful, and when the American Congress adopted the Declaration of Independence he resolved to again enter the fight for freedom, though for a new nation, a new world. Our envoy to the court of France, Dr. Franklin, when writing of him to General Washington, said:

Count Pulaski, of Poland, an officer famous throughout Europe for his bravery and conduct in defense of the liberties of his country, will have the honor of delivering this into your hands. The court here have encouraged and promoted his voyage from an opinion that he may be highly useful in our service.

With this recommendation he was cordially received upon his arrival in Philadelphia in the summer of 1777.

His first blow for the freedom of the colonies was struck at the battle of Brandywine, being the first contest in which that other gallant patriot, Lafayette, took part. General Pulaski was, on the recommendation of Washington, commissioned brigadier-general and chief of dragoons in the United States Army September 15, 1777, being the first general of cavalry in the Army of the United States.

In a letter recently discovered by Col. Joseph Smolinski, dated Charleston, August 19, 1779, appears his declaration to become an American citizen. It is as follows:

I could not submit to stoop before the sovereigns of Europe, so I came to hazard all for the freedom of America, and desirous of passing the rest of my life in a country truly free and before settling as a citizen to fight for liberty.

In the leading events of the campaign following Pulaski occupied a distinguished position. For me to recite his services in detail would cause me to give a minute account of various battles, leading up to the time he received his death wound, while gallantly leading his cavalry at the siege of Savannah, October 9, 1779.

Of the character of Count Pulaski and the great events in his life, especially his invaluable service to America, that entitle him to be numbered among the heroes of America and to be perpetuated in the memory of the people for whom he sacrificed his life, and of the appreciation and high esteem in which his memory is cherished by those sons of Poland who have taken up their homes in this land, I give some of the statements made by Col. Joseph Smolinski, of Washington, D. C., before the Committee on the Library. Colonel Smolinski is the representative of the combined Polish-American societies, specially commissioned by them to assist in consummating the plan to erect this statue to the memory of Count Pulaski:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 22, 1901.

Memorial of Gen. Count Casimir Pulaski, by Col. Joseph Smolinski, of Washington, D. C., representative of the Polish-American organizations in the United States in the Pulaski monument movement, etc.

No page of American history is so full of interest as the one which relates to the Revolutionary period. It gave birth to the highest ideals of patriotism, to the loftiest spirit of devotion to country, immortalized in a thousand glorious actions which constitute a common patrimony of the nation's proud inheritance.

When from the belfry of old Independence Hall Liberty Bell tolled the glad news which announced to the struggling colonists and proclaimed to the world the birth of a new republic with its civilization, democratic institutions, true liberty, and individuality of citizenship, there appeared on the political horizon, among the galaxy of heroes who left their impress upon time, three names which take high rank on the pages of contemporaneous history.

They stand out in bold relief in the Temple of Fame, and the glory which enshrines their memories will grow brighter and brighter as the years roll on. We refer with patriotic pride to the illustrious George Washington, the epitome of whose life is written in the significant and familiar legend: "Father of his country; first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen." Next is the last general of the Polish Republic, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, whose life, indeed, was "poetry put into action," of whom the poet wrote at the sad hour of his death:

"Hope for a season bade the world farewell,
And Freedom shrieked as Kosciuszko fell."

And last, but not least, is the Phil Sheridan of the American cavalry, the brave Casimir Pulaski, who lost his life at the siege of Savannah. The last two warriors were the tried and trusted friends of the immortal Washington, their illustrious commander in chief. They were men of military genius, noble sons of the fair land of Poland, conspicuous exemplars of unswerving fidelity to principle, bright symbols of patriotism and patriotic endeavor, champions of universal freedom.

What greater gift can a people bequeath to a nation than monuments of art which not only symbolize heroic deeds and virtuous actions of great and good men and women, but as object lessons immortalize the achievements of true greatness, so that the generations as they come and go may draw inspiration from the glories of art which so eloquently tell the story of the lives of those whose heroism and virtues stimulate action and excite admiration?

If the assertion is true, who is more deserving of this degree of immortalization than Brig. Gen. Count Casimir Pulaski? The sentiment of appreciation of his worth and meritorious services was emphasized by the representatives of the Continental Congress, who were first to conceive the idea of erecting a monument to his memory. It originated during the stirring period of the war of the Revolution, of which he was one of the heroes and a martyr.

On the 29th of November, 1779, a letter, dated October 31 of that year, from Major-General Lincoln, was read in the Continental Congress. It inclosed a communication of the 5th, same month, from Lieutenant-Colonel Bedaux, of Pulaski's Legion, announcing the death of the last-named officer, whereupon Congress

Resolved, That a monument be erected to the memory of Brigadier Count Pulaski, and that a committee of three be appointed to bring in a resolution for that purpose.

"The members chosen: Mr. Gerry, Mr. Livingston, and Mr. Harnett." After a most careful research among the archives of the Continental Congress, I found no record whatever showing that the resolution was carried out, and consequently the stone of the then proposed monument remains in the quarry.

After the lapse of more than a century, with the record of a vote still standing on the pages of the Journals of the Continental Congress as a public recognition of the eminent services of our hero, as well as an indication of a Republic's forgetfulness, I will not say ingratitude, the Polish-American citizens of our land, who number nearly 3,000,000 of souls, desire and pray that this Congress, the first of the twentieth century, redeem the pledge promised by the Continental Congress, and thus give evidence of the nation's gratitude in appreciation of the meritorious services and noble character of Pulaski, who shed his blood in order that the infant Republic might live.

From out that galaxy of heroes who gave our nation an historic beginning at a momentous period of the world's history not excelled even by the Olympian memories of Pericles, who pictured in thundering eloquence Athenian patriotism, there is one among the many far-shining men, whose renown in valor and deeds is the record of a golden page of our national history, to which it has imparted dignity. This one man I single out as a foreigner by birth, a noble son of that most ancient nation—Poland; a stranger, if you please, but a dear brother by adoption, a veritable Bayard, "without fear and without reproach," a champion in the cause of the oppressed in the cause of freedom, a hero of liberty, nay, an American citizen, baptised in his own blood on the plains of Savannah while defending our beloved land against the enemy.

This proud warrior and hero of liberty gives us in his imperfect English the keynote of his lofty character. I quote from one of his unpublished letters to the Continental Congress, dated Charleston, August 19, 1779, read before that body October 1, 1779, in which also appears his declaration to become an American citizen:

"I could not submit to stoop before the sovereigns of Europe, so I came to hazard all for the freedom of America, desirous of passing the rest of my life in a country truly free, and before settling as a citizen to fight for liberty."

Then in an outburst of indignation at the intrigues and injustice operating in those days as well as our day, he continues:

"But perceiving that endeavors are used to disgust me against such a motive and to regard it as phantom, I am inclined to believe that enthusiasm for liberty is not the predominant virtue in America at this time."

And concludes thus:

"The campaign is at hand. Perhaps I may still have an occasion of showing that I am a friend to the cause without being happy enough to please some individuals." (Papers Continental Congress, No. 164, p. 108.)

It is in the revival of the recollections of what Pulaski did in the cause of freedom on two continents that we are stirred by a sense of deep gratitude and a loyal, patriotic appreciation, willing as lovers of liberty to give evidence of that inspiration born of his example, made holy by his death, in erecting to his memory a monument worthy of his name and fame; one that shall remain on our sacred soil in the nation's great capital, an object lesson, an educator, silent though it be, that shall cause his compatriots to love and cherish more and more as the generations go and come their obligations to this our beloved country, and by thus making them good citizens they will be better fortified and imbued with a proper spirit and a higher ideal of American citizenship against the demoralizing tendencies and pernicious influences of the present day.

Gentlemen, around this monument we pray you to erect, inspired by the fond memories that shall cluster around it like the ivy, there shall grow up that magnificent, ideal citizenship, second to none in the sum of national greatness, that shall insure the safety of the Republic and its perpetuity.

What claim has Pulaski to this recognition?

If, indeed, time lends importance to high station and emphasizes its consecration of heroes and heroic actions in the glories of art, surely the principles of right and justice which they upheld in former times will lose none of their force in the triumphant present.

Few names of the stirring period of the eighteenth century have come down to us with more dignity or clothed in greater attractive romance than the intrepid Lithuanian, Pulaski, who, like his illustrious compatriot and companion in arms, Kosciuszko, touches the tender chords of our sympathy.

Born in 1747, while yet a youth he pledged his life and fortune to liberate his country, both from the invader and the disturbing elements within, under the famous compact of the confederation of Barr, organized by his patriotic father, Count Pulaski, in 1768, who, together with another son, were lost in the great fight for Polish independence.

In the struggles which preceded the first partition of Poland, in 1772, he commanded in many actions and military operations against the flower of the Russian army. His wonderful endowments, skill, and intrepidity excited the admiration of Europe, and drew forth from the writers of the day such estimate of his worth as a soldier as is given in a letter to Washington dated Paris, June 13, 1777, which reads:

"Count Pulaski, who was a general of the Confederates in Poland, and who is gone to join you, is esteemed one of the greatest officers in Europe." (Diplomatic Correspondence of the Revolution, Wharton, vol. 2, p. 339.)

We all know the sad story of the downfall of ill-fated Poland, and we know, too, what herculean efforts Pulaski, Kosciuszko, and other brave companions in arms made to prevent the enactment of the saddest picture of time, that horrid scene, the crucifixion of Poland, the foulest blot on the world's civilization.

Noble Spartan, hopeful to the last that his country will again rise triumphant from the grave of oppression, he saw, like a bright vision from afar, the beautiful temple of liberty building on the Western Hemisphere. There, beneath the furls of our starry banner, his compatriots would find a home in a land of the free.

His generous impulse to serve the struggling colonists, his martial enthusiasm and love of liberty, are forcibly expressed in the following letter of Franklin, the accredited representative of the colonies to France, which resulted in Pulaski's admission to Washington's war councils in the days which tried men's souls:

"Count Pulaski, of Poland, an officer famous throughout Europe for his bravery and conduct in the defense of the liberties of his country against the three great invading powers of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, will have the honor of delivering this into your hands. The court here have encouraged and promoted this voyage, from an opinion that he may be highly useful in our service."

Briefly, in the summer of 1777 he arrived in Philadelphia, entered the service as a volunteer, served successively under Washington, Greene, Wayne, Sullivan, Lafayette, Lincoln, etc. At Brandywine, where the first blows for American independence were struck, his skill, endurance, and bravery were so marked that Washington intrusted him with the command of his body-guard during the close of that memorable action. A few days after the battle "the Father of his Country," in recommending our hero to Congress for appointment and commission as a brigadier-general, says:

"This gentleman has been, like us, engaged in defending the liberty and independence of his country, and has sacrificed his fortune to his zeal for these objects. He derives from hence a title to our respect that ought to operate in his favor as far as the good of the service will permit."

The record shows that Congress confirmed this recommendation, and on September 15, 1778, he was commissioned a brigadier-general and chief of dragoons in the United States Army, though but 30 years of age, having previously been designated as commander of an independent corps, known as the Pulaski Legion, March 28, 1778.

Furthermore, it was left to Pulaski, the father of American cavalry, to demonstrate the value of this arm of the military service, aptly called "the eye of the Army," which up to his coming the Lees, Sumters, Marions, and William Washington failed to show. None of the officers named held higher rank than that of colonel. Pulaski was the first general of cavalry in the American military establishment.

To follow this fearless cavalryman in his rides through the storms of battle from the Atlantic to the Gulf would occupy too much time.

American history, written by numerous versatile pens, contains graphic accounts of his brilliant services.

In conclusion, gentlemen, permit me to invite your attention to the last sad drama in his short but eventful life. It was while gallantly leading the combined American and French cavalry forces against the enemy he received his death wound at the siege of Savannah, Ga., October 9, 1779, and as he was borne from that memorable field moistened with his precious blood, turning to Light Horse Harry Lee, as that officer was familiarly called, he gave him, in feeble accents, this last command, "Follow my lancers, to whom I have given my order of attack," and on October 11, 1779, his spirit took its flight heavenward—called off duty forever.

His memorable charge is thus described by one of his staff officers, Major Rogowski:

For half an hour the guns roared and blood flowed abundantly. Seeing an opening between the enemy's works, Pulaski resolved, with his legion and a small detachment of Georgia cavalry, to charge through, enter the city, confuse the enemy, and cheer the inhabitants with good tidings. General Lincoln approved the daring plan. Imploring the help of the Almighty, Pulaski shouted to his men "Forward!" and we, 200 strong, rode at full speed after him, the earth resounding under the hoofs of our chargers.

For the first two moments all went well. We sped like knights into the peril. Just, however, as we passed the gap between the two batteries a cross fire, like a pouring shower, confused our ranks. I looked around. Oh! sad moment, ever to be remembered, Pulaski lies prostrate on the ground. I leaped toward him, thinking possibly his wound was not dangerous, but a

canister shot had pierced his thigh and the blood was also flowing from his breast, probably from a second wound. Falling on my knees I tried to raise him. He said, in a faint voice, "Jesus! Maria! Joseph!" Further I knew not, for at that moment a musket ball, grazing my scalp, blinded me with blood, and I fell to the ground in a state of insensibility.

He was borne from the bloody field, and, after the conflict was over, was conveyed on board the U. S. brig *Wasp*, to go round to Charleston. The ship, delayed by head winds, remained several days in Savannah River, and during this period he was attended by the most skillful surgeons in the French fleet. It was found impossible to establish suppuration, and gangrene supervened. As the *Wasp* was leaving the river, Pulaski breathed his last. His corpse became so offensive that Colonel Bentalou, his officer in attendance, "was compelled, though reluctantly, to consign to a watery grave all that was now left upon earth of his beloved and honored commander."

Gentlemen, it is to the memory of this great and good man—a fearless soldier, a hero of the war of the Revolution, entitled to the proud distinction of being numbered among the founders of our Republic, an exemplar of patriotism, a champion of liberty, of whom Washington said, "His valor and active zeal on all occasions have done him great honor"—that we Polish-American citizens—I should say American citizens—pray you to immortalize by erecting to his memory a monument of American art which shall stand out in bold relief as the noblest expression of a people's heartfelt gratitude. Thus, too, will this monument, like all others, serve the office of history by endearing in the hearts and minds of generations yet unborn the memories which cluster around the great Revolutionary struggle for liberty, and instill a better appreciation of the sacrifices made by the patriots of 1776, whose heroism we must admire if we can not imitate.

It is designed that this statue, as a work of art, shall emanate from this country. We are treating General Pulaski as an American citizen, which he was, while honoring a hero of liberty who fought on two continents for human freedom.

We believe that this great desire expressed by organized effort to erect a monument to the memory of Pulaski will have a very beneficial effect upon the Poles of this country; we believe it will attach them more dearly to our flag, and as they seem to have an almost idolatrous love for heroism and heroes, and as Pulaski was one of our great Revolutionary characters, we think this monument will have that great tendency.

It will do more than this by emphasizing our appreciation of the inestimable blessings we as a people enjoy as a result of sacrifices made and victories won by the patriots of 1776. To keep alive the memory of heroes through whose sacrifices deliverance came and freedom was made possible, we must not forget the debt of gratitude we owe to the foreigners who so generously aided the immortal Washington in establishing our great Republic.

Let us, then, erect a monument of granite and bronze that shall perpetuate the memory of the heroic dead, Pulaski, who—

"In the thickest fight triumphantly he fell,
While into victory's arms he led us on;
A death so glorious our grief should quell;
We mourn him, yet his battle crown is won."

Liberty was the goal, the price of which was his precious life, and our gratitude should be commensurate with the share of glory that attaches to his noble sacrifice.

It is to perpetuate the memory of this great soldier and hero of the Revolution, of this champion of liberty, by erecting to his memory a monument that I urge the passage of this bill. He fought and died for American independence, he knew the value of freedom. All that was near and dear to him was sacrificed in the struggle against the partition of his native land, his father killed, his country's political existence taken from her, his countrymen coerced or driven into exile; but while a ray of hope remained he fought for Poland, but the combined power of three mighty nations overcame and crushed a patriotic people, and Poland fell. Banished from his native land to seek a home among strangers, it is not to be wondered at that while in France in 1777, his sympathy was at once enlisted with the American colonists, who had declared their independence. He beheld in this effort to throw off the yoke of oppression a struggle like that his country had recently been engaged in. The spirit of liberty for which he had lost everything prompted him to join the forces of those who in the New World had pledged to each other their life and honor to maintain. He came here to prepare a place for the liberty-loving people of his country and to lay the foundation of a country whose people are not only free, but who allow naturalization to all who desire to be.

He laid down his life to secure for the United States the end he had hoped to attain for his own country.

In several instances Washington commended his distinguished services, and always relied on his judgment, bravery, and fidelity to the cause of American independence.

Pulaski was true to his native land, true to the land of his adoption, true to the cause of liberty and freedom, and the people of this country should pay, without further delay, the debt they owe this hero of the American Revolution.

This legislation is urged by over 2,000,000 sons and daughters of Poland who in this country cherish the name of Pulaski. I have received petitions urgently requesting the passage of this bill from over 30 organizations of the Polish National Alliance and several other organizations of citizens of Polish birth or descent, who represent upward of 60,000 of the population of Buffalo, N. Y., the city I have the honor, in part, to represent.

The Committee on the Library of this House, through its chairman, Mr. McCLEARY, favorably reported a similar bill to appropriate \$50,000 for the erection of an equestrian statue to the memory of Brig. Gen. Count Casimir Pulaski in the Fifty-sixth Congress.

I hope that now the pledge of the Continental Congress will be redeemed and that the nation will pass this bill and erect a statue to the honor of this great soldier.

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LESSLER].

Mr. LESSLER. Mr. Chairman, when on the 15th of January last I was sworn in as a member of this House, I was asked, almost on that very day, to appear before the committee having this bill in charge, to say a few words in its favor. I demurred because, to be very frank, I had imagined that what is commonly known as the Revenue-Cutter Service was a matter relating mainly to the steamboats or ships plying up and down New York Bay. I soon found that there was in other quarters the same general ignorance of what this service is. It was then impressed upon me that in all probability, in my Congressional district, there were more ships and more men connected with this service than I had had any conception of; and hence I felt that if, after examining the matter, I should find this to be a meritorious proposition, it was almost my duty to appear before the committee in its support.

I looked up the subject. I found that this service had a history extending away back. I found that it had a complete set of regulations extending away back. I found that it had a school-ship, requiring a corps of highly qualified officers for its direction and management. I found that it had seamen receiving salaries commensurate with those paid to seamen in the Navy. I found that it had officers whom the Government required to be men of education, to wear clothes of a certain stamp, to support themselves as gentlemen in a way befitting officers of such a branch of the Government.

The day I appeared before that committee there was taken up a bill which was to give to some of the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service the thanks of Congress for heroic work performed by them. The men representing the service before the committee had traveled a considerable distance to appear there and tell of the heroism of an officer, a physician, a private, and a seaman of that service in rescuing some men who were serving in the Arctic Zone. It seemed to me that was a pleasant prelude to the plea I had to make before that committee; and it seems to me now, without going into the technicalities of the bill, that any measure which promotes a morale among men, which gives them the idea that this Government does look after them in their old age, that this Government has an eye to their future, that this Government has a proper sense of the eternal fitness of good work and good deeds—that such a measure is calculated to promote the efficiency of any service; and when the day shall come that we have to meet the question of a civil-service pension for the railway mail clerk or any other clerk we shall meet it on the floor of this House with no fear for the future.

These gentlemen who are so startled for the to-morrow of legislation should leave that to-morrow to the men who may be their successors in this House. The distinguished gentleman—and I use that term in return for the courtesy of the term extended to me—referred to me in his minority report and to a statement which I made. I made the statement before the committee that I was informed that this Government printed a book, and that that book had the pictures of uniforms; that it laid down regulations; that it said how many bars and buttons and stripes and everything else a revenue officer should wear, and, further, that I had been informed that one of these men, out of his salary, had to pay \$600 because this Government required him to wear a certain uniform. The gentleman, with that insouciance of temperament which so aptly fits him, refers to me as one of the distinguished gentlemen who brought this business to his attention, and declares that that is his idea of the flunkysm—and, by the way, that is a new phrase, as I understand—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield two more minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LESSLER. He declares that that is his idea of the flunkysm that attaches to the service. He admits that the Revenue-Cutter officer has to pay for the uniform, but he did not get up and howl in his minority report about the Government requiring him to do it. It would be a very great delight to me at least to have time enough to analyze the speech that was made opposing this bill.

It wanders off into everything that appertains to this bill—not. [Laughter.] It goes to every other line of service to draw a parallel; but I want to put before this House its main feature, and that is that here is a body of men who work three hundred and sixty-five days in the year, who, because of the very fact of the small boats that the gentleman refers to, take their lives in their hands, when the men of the Navy are over on the other side and all over the rest of the world on good decks, in good ships, and they are not required to brave in times of peace, of hard weather and good weather, day in and day out, the dangers of the sea, trying to earn their money and doing men's duty in men's positions. If these positions in the Revenue-Cutter Service are not for men, then let the Government so declare. Being for men, let us put them where we have put other men and increase by this bill the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERMAN. Will the gentleman from Illinois use some time now?

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman desires me to, I will.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no one else to yield to this minute.

Mr. RYAN. I will say to my colleague on the committee [Mr. SHERMAN] that my colleague from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE] is ready to go on for five minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Very well; I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE].

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, this is a meritorious measure, and deserves the favorable consideration of this House. By their fidelity to service, their loyal and patriotic devotion to duty, their valiant service in times of war, their heroic conduct in the battles which were fought on sea in defense of our country and our flag, their efficient work in times of peace, the Revenue-Cutter Service has merited the commendation of the Government, and deserves the recognition which this bill proposes to give it. It deserves to be placed, so far as rank and retirement are concerned, on a parity with the Navy of the United States.

The Revenue-Cutter Service has a magnificent history. It antedates that of the regular Navy. It was organized in 1790, and in every war our country fought since that time its men have rendered brave and heroic service. They helped to fight the battles of 1812, the Mexican war, the war of the rebellion, and the recent war with Spain. They have in times of war been an efficient aid to the Navy, and in many instances their heroism was surprising and commands our admiration. Examine the record of this service and you will find that in whatever naval combat its men were called into requisition, or in whatever conflict they took a part, the gallantry of the officers and the men, the daring and the courage of the Revenue-Cutter Service were equal to and unexcelled by the Navy itself.

In the war with Spain the Revenue-Cutter Service took an active and distinguished part. Thirteen revenue cutters, carrying 61 guns, 98 officers, and 562 men, rendered efficient aid to our Navy. In the famous battle of Manila the *McCulloch* was assigned to duty by Admiral Dewey, and when the victory was won, which sent a thrill of joy through every American heart and gladdened the soul of every American freeman, it was the *McCulloch* that carried to Hongkong the dispatches announcing to the world our national triumph, and Admiral Dewey in his dispatch to the Secretary of the Navy commends the *McCulloch* as a valuable auxiliary to the naval squadron.

Side by side with the naval torpedo boat *Winslow* the revenue cutter *Hudson* fought the battle of Cardenas, and the *Windom*, of the Revenue-Cutter Service, demolished the light-house and destroyed the rendezvous of the Spanish troops at Cienfuegos. Nor must it be overlooked that the *Manning* rendered such splendid aid in many engagements with the foe that the officers of the Navy officially commended the zeal and meritorious service of these revenue-cutter men.

But it is needless to multiply the instances in which the Revenue-Cutter Service helped to win the battles or attain the achievements which now has made this country a world power. The report of the committee contains the facts which show what admirable and efficient work was done by this service during the war, how this service received the praise of the officers of the Navy and of the Navy Department itself, how much is due to this Revenue-Cutter Service for aiding the naval vessels and the naval forces in accomplishing the victories which have contributed so much to make this country the greatest and most glorious on earth. [Applause.]

In time of peace the men of this service are constantly at work. When the officers of the Navy are either in foreign or domestic ports enjoying their ease and comfort, and enjoying their social life, and engaging in their social functions, the Revenue-Cutter Service are daily performing active work in the interest of the Government. Class them as you will, after all they are the coast-wise navy. It is the coast which in times of peace, as well as in war, the Revenue-Cutter Service must protect and guard and police. The Senate Committee on Commerce have well stated the status of the Revenue-Cutter Service in these words:

The military character of the Revenue-Cutter Service was officially stated by the Treasury Department in the report of the service in 1881, as follows:

"The Revenue-Cutter Service, while charged by law with the performance of important civil duties, is essentially military in its character. Each vessel is provided with great guns and furnished with as full a complement of small arms for its crew as any ship of war. Its officers are required to be proficient in military drill and possess a thorough knowledge of the uses of both great and small arms.

"Its crews are required to be instructed from day to day at the great guns and in the use of small arms. Commanding officers are required, while boarding vessels arriving in ports of the United States, in case of failure or refusal of any such vessel on being hailed to come to and submit to the proper inspection by an officer of the service, to fire first across her bows as a warning, and in case of persistent refusal to resort to shot or shell to compel obedience. In the performance of this work they are likely at any time to receive injuries and to be subjected to the same dangers in time of peace as the force employed on naval vessels.

"By act of March 2, 1790, it is provided that the revenue cutters shall, whenever the President so directs, cooperate with the Navy. It will be observed that the cooperation of the two services prescribed in the act above quoted is not contingent upon a state of war or other particularly perilous

conditions. On the contrary, it may take place in time of peace, and for specific purposes and when less hazard is involved to the two services than pertains to the discharge of a revenue vessel of its ordinary duties.

"But if in legal theory they are civil employees, are they so in fact? Are they less positively a part of the military force in time of war than the Army or Navy? It is true that revenue vessels are not to be ordered into action on purely military service, offensive or defensive, except the President so directs; neither are the vessels of the Navy."

It is not my purpose to dwell on the many and varied duties which the law requires of the revenue service. It aids in the protection of the revenue; it assists in the enforcement of the revenue and the maritime laws; it helps in the enforcement of quarantine regulations; it is called into requisition to see to the enforcement of the neutrality laws; it assists in carrying out the navigation laws of the Government.

For the men of this service there is no vacation, no ease, no comfort, no special social distinction, no such distinction as seems to have been accorded to the American Navy. But they are men of nautical skill, of excellent discipline, of fine intelligence, and ought to take rank with the naval service. It is unfair that they should be discriminated against. By their conduct in times of peace as well as in war they have earned the right to be placed on an equality with the Navy so far as to give them rank and the right to be placed on retired lists.

Whatever opinion I may hold as to whether there ever should have been such a thing as a retired list for either Army or Navy, the fact remains that such a list exists. So long as it does, give to the men whose bravery, and courage, and heroism is as great as that of any man who ever trod the deck of man-of-war the same rights as to rank and retirement as the law accords to the Navy now. To do less is an injustice to this splendid service. Give them the recognition which is their due, for they deserve the benefits this bill would confer.

I believe this will promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service. I am not one of those who fear that this bill is but the entering wedge to a place on the civil-pension list. Whenever the time comes that a demand is made to pension the men of the Revenue-Cutter Service, it will be time enough to discuss that proposition.

It is not before us now. When it comes, if it ever shall, there will be enough courage displayed by this House to meet that question properly and in the interest of the people. I shall vote for this bill as it is now framed because, in my judgment, it is just and right to the men and, above all, because I believe it will raise the standard of the service and promote its efficiency.

For what this Revenue-Cutter Service has done in times of war; for what, judging by its brilliant record, it is ready to do again should the safety of our country require or our national honor or our flag be again assailed; for what the service is doing in times of peace in effectively aiding, amid frequent danger and discomfort, in the execution and enforcement of the maritime and revenue laws; because I believe that while the Cutter Service is, after all, in a practical, though not in a legal, sense a part of the military force of this country; because I am opposed to unjust discrimination against the men of this service, whose discipline, whose training, whose proficiency in the practical use of arms entitles them to take a place side by side with the men of our American Navy, I earnestly trust that the bill will pass. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to know what time is now remaining to the two sides?

The CHAIRMAN. One hour and thirteen minutes remain to the gentleman from New York, and one hour and twenty-one minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. SHERMAN. I understand that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] does not care to occupy any more time this evening.

Mr. MANN. I should prefer not to.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then I move that the committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. OLMSTED, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (S. 1025) to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had presented this day to the President of the United States for his approval bills of the following titles:

H. R. 11418. An act granting an increase of pension to Hannah T. Knowles;

H. R. 12315. An act granting an increase of pension to James Todd;

H. R. 10486. An act granting a pension to Alida Payne; and

H. R. 2273. An act granting a pension to Martha A. De Lamater.

SENATE BILL AND RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill and the following Senate concurrent resolution were taken from Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 4872. An act to amend an act entitled "An act governing the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents," approved January 12, 1895—to the Committee on Printing.

Senate concurrent resolution 33:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed and bound in cloth 6,000 copies of the revised course of study for Indian schools, 1,500 for the use of the Senate, 3,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 1,500 for the use of the Superintendent of Indian Schools—

to the Committee on Printing.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WARNOCK for one week, on account of important business.

And then, on motion of Mr. SHERMAN (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communication was taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an additional estimate of appropriation for armament of fortifications—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ADAMS, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 84) to increase the efficiency of the foreign service of the United States and to provide for the reorganization of the consular service, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1313); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LACEY, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12536) to further amend section 2399 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1314); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JONES of Washington, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2442) confirming title to the State of Nebraska of certain selected indemnity school lands, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1315); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 306) to provide for the payment of overtime claims of letter carriers excluded from judgment as barred by limitation, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1316); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WANGER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1892) to provide for the construction of a revenue cutter for services at the port of Philadelphia, Pa., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1317); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TIRRELL, from the Committee on Education, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18) to provide for the education of the blind, etc., reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1318); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TOMPKINS of Ohio, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3109) for preventing the adulteration, misbranding, and imitation of foods, beverages, candies, drugs, and condiments in the District of Columbia and the Territories, and for regulating interstate traffic therein, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1319); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. KEHOE, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 8265, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 197) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Mrs. E. Taylor, accompanied by a report (No. 1310); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KYLE, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1726) for the relief of the Merritt & Chapman Derrick and Wrecking Company, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1311); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. OTJEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13223) for the relief of Mary E. O. Dashiell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1312); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Naval Affairs was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8246) for the relief of George H. Mellen, deceased, and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 13285) to abolish slavery in the Philippine Archipelago, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WOODS: A bill (H. R. 13286) to amend sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled "An act to determine the jurisdiction of the circuit courts of the United States and to regulate the removal of causes from the State courts, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1875, as the same is amended by an act approved March 3, 1887, as amended by an act approved August 13, 1888—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 13287) to incorporate the Columbia Heat and Power Company of the District of Columbia, and to manufacture gas for heat and power purposes, to construct, maintain, and operate gas-manufacturing plants, and to lay necessary street mains and connections for the distribution of gas for heat and power purposes throughout the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 13288) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River in Marion County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ADAMS: A resolution (H. Res. 198) to provide a rule for the consideration of H. R. 84—to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 13289) granting a pension to Henry D. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 13290) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Ellis, Company B, Thirteenth Tennessee Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 13291) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McDonald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 13292) for the relief of Samuel Robbins—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COONEY: A bill (H. R. 13293) granting a pension to George W. Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 13294) to correct the military record of name, and so forth, of John Dorsey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Florida: A bill (H. R. 13295) for the relief of John McGovern—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 13296) granting an increase of pension to Francis Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 13297) granting a pension to Martin Greeley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASKINS: A bill (H. R. 13298) granting a pension to James L. Swann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 13299) for the relief of John S. Williford—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JACKSON of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 13300) granting an increase of pension to Martin Boyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACKSON of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 13301) for the relief of Benjamin T. Hooper and Marcellus Aaron—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13302) granting a pension to John W. Parsons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13303) construing discharges of members of Company A, First Maryland Eastern Shore Volunteers, as honorable—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KYLE: A bill (H. R. 13304) for the relief of John P. Hilliard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13305) for the relief of Charles B. Fletcher—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13306) for the relief of James O. Minton—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 13307) for the relief of Valdemar Poulsen—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 13308) granting an increase of pension to John T. Boyle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13309) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Hazzard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13310) granting a pension to Anna McGowan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 13311) for the relief of Jane Brewer, widow of Jacob H. Brewer, of Washington County, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13312) for the relief of George W. Dant—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 13313) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, at Bellefonte, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13314) for the relief of the trustees of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, at Bellefonte, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13315) for the relief of M. H. Carr—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: A bill (H. R. 13316) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Olcott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13317) granting an increase of pension to Albert G. Dole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13318) granting an increase of pension to Fergus P. McMillan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 13319) for the relief of W. M. Quinn and George L. Long—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STARK: A bill (H. R. 13320) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Simmons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS: A bill (H. R. 13321) granting an increase of pension to John S. Bonham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 13322) granting a pension to George W. Sutton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 13323) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Barger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 13324) granting an increase of pension to John J. Cross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEHOE, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 197, in lieu of H. R. 8265) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of Mrs. E. Taylor—to the Private Calendar.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: Petition of Shirt Waist and Laundry Workers' Union No. 10, Philadelphia, Pa., for the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BALL of Delaware: Petition of Bower Glaziers' Union of Wilmington, Del., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BELL: Petition of congregation of East Second Street Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Denver, Colo., favoring an amendment to the Constitution to prevent polygamy, and in favor of all antisaloon and antvice legislation for the Philippines—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Stanton Post, No. 37, Grand Army of the Republic, of Colorado and Wyoming, for investigation of the Bureau of Pensions—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolutions of Delta State Bank, of Delta, Colo., favoring

a reduction of letter postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of Mill and Smeltermen's Union No. 92, of Gillett, Colo., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: Petition of citizens of Elizabethton, Tenn., on the subject of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURK of Pennsylvania: Petition of Naval Command No. 1, Camp No. 91, Spanish-American War Veterans, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of Senate bill 1220—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CORLISS: Paper to accompany House bill to amend the military record of John Dorsey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DARRAGH: Papers to accompany House bill 10869, granting an increase of pension to Michael K. Strayer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of the National Hay Association, Winchester, Ind., favoring House bill 8337 and Senate bill 3575, amending the interstate-commerce act—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Resolutions of Bricklayers and Plasterers' Union No. 39, of New Bedford, Mass., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of same organization, favoring the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Resolutions of Pomona Grange, No. 9, Fairfield County, Conn., favoring House bill 6578, to improve postal facilities—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. JACKSON of Maryland: Petition of Marcellus Aaron and Benjamin T. Hooper, heirs at law of Abram Mister, concerning loss of schooner *Chesapeake*—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KERN: Resolutions of Green Hide Workers' Union No. 147; Division No. 49, Locomotive Engineers; Lodge No. 545, Railroad Trainmen; Division No. 386, Railway Conductors, and Painters and Paper Hangers' Union No. 215, all of East St. Louis, Ill.; Bakers and Confectioners' Union No. 69; Bricklayers' Union No. 21; Iron Molders' Union No. 182; Glass Bottle Blowers' Union No. 23, and Team Drivers' Union No. 50, all of Belleville, Ill.; Coopers' Union No. 53, of New Athens, Ill.; Bricklayers' Union No. 35, of Centralia, Ill.; Federation of Labor of Lebanon, and Carpenters and Joiners' Union of Percy, Ill., favoring an educational test for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LAMB: Resolutions of the Central Labor Union of Norfolk, Va., favoring the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LESSLER: Resolutions of the Lighting Fixture Association of New York, protesting against the ratification of the French reciprocity treaty—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of American Council, No. 67, Junior Order United American Mechanics, Brooklyn, N. Y., in favor of Senate bill 1891 and the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MUTCHLER: Petition of Onoko Division, No. 257, Locomotive Engineers, Mauchunk, Pa., favoring the passage of the Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of Nathaniel Lyon Circle, No. 106, Ladies of Grand Army of the Republic, South Bethlehem, Pa., favoring a bill providing pensions to certain officers and men in the Army and Navy and increasing widows' pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEVILLE: Evidence in support of House bill 12519, granting a pension to Hugh McFadden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: Petition of Salem Grange, No. 291, Patrons of Husbandry, Beach Haven, Pa., protesting against the irrigation of arid lands of the West—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania: Papers to accompany House bill 11937 for the relief of Mrs. George Dalton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 12970, granting a pension to Frederick Dutrer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of General Doubleday Post, No. 189, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the passage of House bill 3067—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAY of New York: Resolution of Independent Division, No. 374, Railway Conductors, Elmira, N. Y., favoring a further restriction of Chinese immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the same body, favoring an educational restriction on immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Papers to accompany House bill 13315, for the relief of M. H. Carr—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany House bill 13313, for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South at Bellefonte, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany House bill 13314, for the relief of the trustees of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church at Bellefonte, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUCKER: Resolutions of Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen No. 54, Moberly, Mo., for the passage of House bill 9330, for a further restriction of Chinese immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN: Resolutions of Retail Clerks' Union No. 212, and Brewery Engineers and Firemen's Union No. 80, Buffalo, N. Y., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Pattern Makers' Association, Buffalo, N. Y., favoring House bill 9053, to enforce the law of domicile—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolution of Polish Society of Meriden, Conn., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petitions of Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Charlestown, Swiftwater, Farmington, and Exeter, N. H., favoring an amendment to the Constitution making polygamy a crime—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG: Resolution of Carpenters' Union No. 463, Flint Glass Workers' Union No. 19, and Chartered Society of Lace Curtain Operatives, Philadelphia, Pa., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, April 3, 1902.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. HALE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal, without objection, will be approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented a petition of Muncie Lodge, No. 20, Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers, of Muncie, Ind., praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the Dairymen's Mutual Association of Evansville, and of Burnell Smith and sundry other citizens of Mongu, in the State of Indiana, praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 204, of New Albany; of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 335, of Hammond, and of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 382, of Rushville, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against the reduction of the present duty on cigars imported from Cuba; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Jones-Darling Camp, No. 186, National Association of Spanish-American War Veterans, of Elkhart, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the desecration of the American flag; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Flint & Walling Manufacturing Company, of Kendallville, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a reorganization of the consular service of the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Chandler & Taylor Company, of Indianapolis, Ind., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the adoption of the so-called metric system of weights and measures to the exclusion of the present standard; which was referred to the Select Committee on Standards, Weights, and Measures.

He also presented petitions of General Lawton Herd, No. 5, Noble Order of Buffaloes, of Fairmount; of Frank L. Littleton and 750 members of the League of American Sportsmen, of Indianapolis, and of Z. T. Sweeny, of Columbus, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for

the protection of the birds and wild animals of the country; which were referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented the petitions of S. M. Keltner, of Anderson; of Bert A. Beidler, of Auburn; of H. N. Spaan, of Indianapolis, and of A. A. Tripp, of North Vernon, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the protection of game in Alaska; which were referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented petitions of Bricklayers' Local Union No. 12, of Marion; of Typographical Union No. 1, of Indianapolis; of Retail Clerks' Local Union No. 291, of Dunkirk; of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union No. 431, of Brazil; of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union No. 533, of Jeffersonville; of Bakers and Confectioners' Local Union No. 195, of Anderson; of Stone Masons' Local Union No. 21, of Marion; of Veedersburg Local Union, No. 71, of Veedersburg; of Bricklayers' Local Union No. 8, of Anderson; of Typographical Union No. 332, of Muncie; of Stone Masons' Local Union No. 27, of Wabash; of Typographical Union No. 287, of Frankfort; of Hoosier Lodge, No. 582, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Richmond; of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 382, of Rushville; of Typographical Union No. 76, of Terre Haute, and of Local Union No. 159, of Marion, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CLAPP presented a petition of M. Clancy Division, No. 360, Order of Railway Conductors, of Two Harbors, Minn., praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DRYDEN presented memorials of sundry citizens of Paterson, Jersey City, Trenton, Harrison, Camden, Newark, and Hoboken, all in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, and praying for the passage of the so-called Wadsworth substitute; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of William Fitz Randolph, of Newmarket, N. J., and the petition of C. L. Beach, of Newark, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of S. Scheurer & Co., of Paterson; of Dr. W. Thum, of Newark; of Benjamin D. Van Beusen, of Hoboken; of Dr. Francis H. Munroe, of Newark; of G. H. White, of Jersey City; of Ammon & Person, of Jersey City; of the Melting and Churning Company, of Hoboken; of F. Gunther, of Hoboken; of J. M. Jurgansen, of Hoboken; of L. Schuchmen, of Jersey City; of Dr. Ferdinand Sanes, of Jersey City; of J. G. Patton, of Paterson; of Dr. A. R. Judson, of Newport; of Dr. W. J. Burd, of Belvidere; of Dr. D. F. Cartell, of Jersey City; of Mrs. P. J. Klahr, of Jersey City; of M. W. Hull, of Jersey City; of Dr. J. J. Bauman, of Jersey City; of John Thompson, of Jersey City; of Dr. L. B. Parsell, of Closter; of Dr. A. Topfer, of Jersey City; of Edgar Williams, of Orange; of G. W. Ross, of Jersey City; of John R. Hennessey & Co., of Jersey City; of Beach Bros., of Jersey City; of Harry S. Ford, of Pensauken; of J. F. Hussey, of Paterson; of E. W. L. Dowling, of Jersey City, and of Thomas E. Smith, of Jersey City, all in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GAMBLE presented a petition of Lead City Miners' Union, of Lead City, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. KEAN presented petitions of W. J. Henshaw, of Chicago, Ill.; of R. B. Harrison, of Chesterfield; of Jacob W. Edwards, of Long Branch; of Dr. Edgar Roberts, of Keyport; of Macy Carhart, of Keyport; of E. G. Gill, of Haddonfield; of the Hildebrand Company, of Elizabeth; of William Howard, of Rahway; of Herman J. Lohmann, of Jersey City, and of Friesburg Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Cohansey, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of the S. B. Ellis Company, of Jersey City; of Dr. Norton L. Wilson, of Elizabeth; of Dr. E. B. Silvers, of Rahway; of George Froggott, of Elizabeth; of E. S. E. Newbury, of Elizabeth; of William Meyer, of Elizabeth; of S. A. Poppenga, of Elizabeth; of J. W. Orr, of Elizabethport; of William Kilby, of Elizabethport; of M. E. Connor, of Elizabethport; of Walsh & Redhead, of Elizabethport; of M. Lange & Sons, of Elizabethport; of Charles G. Dow, of Elizabeth; of Moses Mendel, jr., of Elizabeth; of F. Gunther, of Hoboken; of William O'Connor, of Hoboken; of H. O. Wittpenn, of Jersey City; of Albert E. Roy, of Jersey City; of T. C. Kinkead, of Jersey City; of J. R.